

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is sometimes said that the first disciples formed the greatest of all Theological Colleges, with the Master Teacher at the head. If so, we seem to have travelled a considerable distance from that conception of a Theological College. The Twelve were chosen, in the first place, 'that they might be with him.' They learned their lessons as they moved with Him from place to place, as they watched Him dealing with the sick, the suffering, the anxious, the careless, and the penitent. In a modern College, some of the students, some also of the teachers, are in frequent contact with working, struggling, sinning, and suffering men and women; but the College itself is a stationary, and, on the whole, a cloistered affair.

Another great difference is the importance that a modern College attaches to a library. Modern teaching about the meaning of the Christian religion is based largely on books. The disciple circle had no library, and we never hear of our Lord using a text-book except certain sections of the Old Testament. We are not suggesting that our modern Colleges should dispense with their libraries. We do suggest that it is possible for theology to become too bookish, and too divorced from the realities of life.

One of the obvious and welcome facts about *The Heart of Christ's Religion*, by the Rev. Canon C. E. RAVEN (Longmans; paper 4s. 6d. net, cloth 6s. net), is that it is not a bookish book.

Canon RAVEN has read books and plenty of them; but this book is written out of his heart and out of his experience of life, especially of his practical work among men, first in Hoxton and later in Cambridge. He writes not as a scholar but as a working parson.

The Rev. E. Stanley Jones tells us of Hindus who will feel insulted if they are called Christians, but highly honoured if they are called Christ-like men. In our own country men of our day are moved like the men of old by the appeal of Christ; but they tell us they cannot find Him in organized religion. Canon RAVEN believes they would find Him if they could be made to see Him as He is. He takes for his text the words of 1 Jn 4th: 'God is love.'

His thesis is that this is not *a* truth about God, but *the* truth, the only truth, even as it is the only truth about the world and about man; that any Christian theology to be worthy of the name, must be the elaboration of this central thesis. Love is the keynote of the process of evolution. The entry of love into the heart is conversion. The Atonement is love leading us in the path of the new life. The doctrine of the Trinity is a necessity of God's existence if God is love.

There is no more moving section in the book than that in which Canon RAVEN discusses the application of this thesis to suffering. In the

distress of his last illness, the late Professor Veitch of Glasgow used to exclaim: 'Why am I of all men called on to suffer thus?' It was the cry of the hero of the Old Testament drama. To Job, the suffering of a righteous man was a problem. 'Why should such a fine man as I am be singled out to bear the loss of my asses, my sheep, my camels, my servants, my house, my sons? Why should I be smitten with a loathsome disease and become an outcast?'

It has not always been recognized that certain sayings of Jesus seem almost to have had Job's problem in view. 'There is no man that hath left house . . . or children, or lands for my sake and the gospel's' but he shall find the world well lost. The very possessions the deprivation of which shook Job's faith in God, the followers of Jesus were called on voluntarily to surrender, or at least to be ready to surrender, for the Master's sake. The Satan was enjoined to spare Job's life: to the followers of Jesus the message was that to save their lives was to lose them.

Suffering is the way of love. In spite of Nature, red in tooth and claw, through suffering alone love reaches its true fulfilment. Yet not all suffering is the suffering of love. There is involuntary suffering, due to our own past folly, which we may receive only as a blow to our self-esteem, and so may lead only to irritation and bitterness. But even involuntary suffering of this kind may be accepted willingly and almost joyfully when we place ourselves on the side of love and make the suffering the occasion of a revolt against the domination of self.

Love finds its truest strength when it is voluntary suffering endured for the sake of others. Such love can never fail, for it means that self has once for all been conquered. Before such love death loses its terrors. For death finds its sting in sin which is the surrender to the self. When the self is swallowed up by love, death is but the gateway to a wider life of love. For all its suffering, love is essentially a thing of joy and happiness. If the first fruit of the Spirit is joy, the second is love.

Some people show a splendid fortitude in bearing other people's sufferings. But the temptation of the loving heart is to grow restive under the agonies of those we love. We feel so helpless; we fear that fate or the laws of Nature are too strong for us. But he that is saved is he that endures to the end, who believes to the end that God is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.

The greatest tragedy of all is when our vicarious suffering finds no response, when the Father's arms are outstretched and the wayward son refuses to run to them, when the very knowledge of what the Father is suffering for his sake creates a tension that may turn to bitterness and hatred. Are we quite sure that our anxiety is altogether for the loved one and not in some measure for our own happiness and peace of mind? The love that seeks a return is no Christian love. True love can never fail. God's spirit embraces all, embraces not merely ourselves but the friend for whom our soul is in travail, and in drawing nearer to God we are drawing nearer to all God loves.

The Rev. Oliver C. QUICK, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, is one of the brightest and most original of that band of theologians who are adorning the Church of England at the present time. In his new book, *The Gospel of Divine Action* (Nisbet; 5s. net), Dr. QUICK follows out a train of thought that is interesting as a speculation and valuable in its practical bearings. He points out that Reality contains two aspects—cause and reason. Things are both instruments and signs. The order of reason and the order of cause alike exist beyond me, and are not imposed on things either by my thought or by my action. Reality, therefore, reveals itself both to me and within me as rational thought and causative activity because these exist in the Being from whom any universal order proceeds. So in relation to God all things must be considered either as signs in which His truth is expressed to us, or as instruments wherewith He directs the course of events

through change towards the fulfilment of His purpose. Here, then, we have the starting-points for two lines of thought about God's relation to the world. You can look on the world as a series of successive events through which God is working out His will. Or else you can look on the world as a system of signs which manifest God as their meaning. That is the gist of the discussion with which Canon QUICK's book opens. Thenceforward it proceeds less metaphysically.

This distinction between instrumentalism and symbolism corresponds roughly to the distinction between the Hebraism of the Old Testament and the Hellenism of the Platonic tradition. The most obvious characteristic of Hebrew theology is the belief in God's guidance of history, a consequence of which is that all Hebrew religion is centred on a hope for the future. For Plato, on the other hand, salvation consists in the philosopher-saint's knowledge of eternal unchanging realities. For the Platonist the world is a system of symbols which are revealing signs, whereas for the Jew it is the scene of a great act of God. And the two systems give an altogether diverse value to conscious theoretic knowledge.

In the New Testament we see the wine of the Christian revelation beginning to burst the bottles of Judaism, and we can understand how it is that the theology of historic Christianity has combined and fused together both Judaic and Hellenic elements. Look at St. Paul. The whole of the Pauline theology is based upon the fundamental notion of God's great act of grace in Christ. But he transcends the mere notion of instrumentalism in his Christ-mysticism, which, if not Platonic, is certainly not characteristically Jewish. St. John, on the other hand, leans strongly to the other category of symbolism. While St. Paul's characteristic word is 'grace,' St. John's is 'truth.' And by truth St. John means spiritual reality. But while in every aspect of his thinking St. John is a symbolist, and it is truth and not fact which everywhere appears in his writings, yet because the truth is love, its glory is most truly revealed in outward action, and most of all when the

Word was made flesh and tabernacled among us.

This contrast and harmony between St. Paul's theology and St. John's are beautifully worked out by Canon QUICK. But our interest increases as the argument touches contemporary thought. In the New Testament the thought that God has acted in Jesus is the foundation of the whole doctrine of Christ's Person. The rest is superstructure or interpretation. Moreover, from first to last the Divine revelation in Jesus is conceived as dependent upon the Divine action through Jesus. But the Christology of modern humanitarianism inverts this order. The facts in the Gospel are represented as significant not because they are Divine acts, but because they reveal God. The Cross for humanitarian theology is the centre of Christianity because it is the essential part of the sign, because the truth is revealed supremely there. We are invited first to acknowledge the unique human goodness of Jesus, and then, with the help of a philosophy of values, to pass on to accept Him as the perfect symbol of Godhead upon earth. Harnack and Streeter are cited as the representatives of this modern interpretation.

It is small wonder that the obvious discrepancy of this theology from the New Testament has provoked a violent and extreme reaction in quite recent years. In Germany the reaction is headed by Barth. In England, Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and others give a totally different reading of the New Testament from that which is congenial to Streeter and others of his school. Barthianism can be understood best as a thoroughgoing attempt to break free from the Hellenistic tradition which has in one form or another dominated Christian theology for so long, and to start once more from radically Hebraic conceptions of the Godhead. Indeed, in its extreme utterances the Barthian theology strikes one as being more Biblical than that of the Bible, and more Hebraic than that of the Old Testament.

In any case, Barthians make it abundantly plain that what really matters in the whole Bible-story, on which Christian theology ought to be founded,

is not the revelation of any universal reality conveyed through symbols, but rather what God has done, is doing, and will do; and the greatest characteristic of the Divine acts is to confound the natural reason and conscience of mankind. It is idle for man to try to find God by seeking to understand His creation, for, according to Barth, the Biblical doctrine of the Creation is intended precisely to emphasize the impassable gulf between the Creator and the creature. It is idle for man to seek to know God through his moral ideals, for the ethics of the Bible are not the ethics of the moral philosopher. In short, the Bible is not concerned with the doings of man but with the doings of God. And the life of Christ reveals God only in being the crowning act of power, which once for all convicts all human ideals and ideas of their impotence and folly.

Canon QUICK indicates the extent to which Barthianism is influencing the scholars and thinkers of our own country, and indulges in a little mild criticism of Barth. Surely, he says, the Bible cannot be quite so Biblical, and may be even more Christian than Barthians would have us believe. If God be really eternal love, then somehow the life of Jesus must be the symbol not only of God's constant purpose and universal operation among men, but also of that perfection in act and knowledge after which man's natural faculties have from his birth been blindly seeking. And so Canon QUICK comes back to the real New Testament, from which Barthianism is a partial departure, and sees in the Incarnate Life both act of God and revelation of God. It is an act of God because it is characteristic of God always and thus truly symbolic of His whole purpose in the world, and it is symbol only because here uniquely is the act of God.

The series of 'Westminster Books' edited by Archdeacon Storr and Principal Sydney Cave promises to be of great value, dealing as they do in untechnical language with those questions of religion and ethics which are arousing interest or causing perplexity to-day in the minds of many.

Not the least useful is the volume now published, *What is Salvation?* by Professor E. S. WATERHOUSE, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. net).

We are accustomed to speak freely of Christ as Saviour, and of an experience of salvation, but what precisely do we mean? The question 'What is salvation?' is no simple one, but leads on to many others. 'From what are we saved? How are we saved? Who is, or who is not, saved? Is it faith that saves us, and, if so, what place must be given to goodness of life and character?' All these and other vital questions await our answer.

It may be best if we approach the question from the standpoint of experience and its psychological interpretation. The history of the Christian doctrine of salvation is very long and complicated, but behind it all there lies the fact that, before there was any formal theology connecting the forgiveness of sin with the death of Christ, Christians who had experienced the forgiveness of sin regarded the death of Christ as the ground of that experience. 'The matter, looked at from this viewpoint, resolves itself into a clear issue. Granted that theological explanations of the connexion between the death of Jesus and the Christian experience grew up, and one and all proved unsatisfactory, yet that is no reason for ignoring a fact that is abundantly witnessed by history, namely, that the death of Jesus was, from the earliest times, connected with the experience of salvation.'

How, to begin with, did this connexion arise? It undoubtedly grew out of the teaching of Jesus Himself, and His attitude to His own death. He spoke of His death as a 'ransom,' and He manifestly regarded it 'as a necessary part of the service He had come to earth to render, that is, to put men into a new and a right relation to God.' It was not simply a martyr's death, and was never so regarded. From the first it was taken to be a mighty saving act, the great means of freeing man from the power that holds him. Nothing less than this, no theological dogma unsupported by experience, can explain the fact that 'in some way

or other the death of Jesus has been connected with the sense of pardon in the lives of millions.'

What then, we may ask, has the death of Jesus done, and what influence has it had on human life? The first part of the answer is that it has opened men's eyes to the nature of sin. 'The story of the Best and Greatest being hounded to death by cruelty and treachery struck home in a way that no warning against sin in general could ever have done.' The Cross showed the world that sin is the mortal enemy of goodness. Calvary has for ever swept away the light and superficial view of sin which characterized the Greeks.

Further, it has spoken to man's heart appealingly in the language of suffering love, a *lingua franca* that is universally understood. 'I could die for you, is the lover's litany, and Calvary has been the fount of love, for it has shown that God's love is even unto death.' It has enabled men to love God in a way that would otherwise have been impossible. 'On the psychological side, therefore, the death of Christ serves actually to deliver man from the power of his own wrong-doing by awakening him to its nature, and by creating a sense of love towards God, whose love is revealed in the Cross. That the words "God so loved that He gave" are amongst the most well beloved in Scripture is proof enough of the connexion between redemptive love and the life and death of Jesus, for words that awoke no echoes in the experience of men could never have had the response that has been given to these.'

Theological difficulties which have been raised in the endeavour to find a logical connexion between the death of Christ and the salvation of man have sometimes rather tended to obscure what is obvious in experience. To ask whether Christ's death was necessary, and whether another way might not have been found, is an inadmissible question, since it requires for an answer a knowledge of the Divine will such as no one can hope to possess. 'One might as well ask why God created a world at all, and allowed evil therein.' Nor is it relevant to urge that the death of Christ, the innocent for the

guilty, was unjust. 'If so, life is unjust from beginning to end. . . . It is not "just" that a man should lose his life in a vain attempt to pull some wretched suicide from the river, it is something *more* than just. Justice holds the scales of reckoning in her hands, but the finest things of life pass all reckoning. Admit, if you will, that if Jesus died for sins not His own it was "unjust." It yet remains that there is that which is far more than justice.'

Now, further, what do we mean when we say that a man is saved? Salvation is something wider than the forgiveness of sins. By common consent it is demanded that those who are saved, or profess to be so, must show the quality of their salvation in their daily life. Why should there be this expectation? Religion and morality, now so firmly united in our thought, are in their origin distinct. Religion springs out of a sense of the numinous, a sense of awe in the presence of God, which had not necessarily anything moral in it. Morality, on the other hand, when traced back is found to have its roots chiefly in social custom. The distinction still persists, and so it is that we find, on the one hand the moral man with little of the religious sense, and on the other hand the religious man whose moral sense is defective. But, now, we expect a unity. Religion without morality is a dead thing, but on the other hand morality without religion lacks something vital. What is that something?

In other words, what is the differentia of the saved man? 'Its essence is this. All of us are egoists born. Self is the first natural centre of existence. Yet the key saying of Jesus, indeed the only one found in all four Gospels, and five times in the four, declares that those who find their lives lose them. "If any man come after me, let him deny himself." How poorly are those words interpreted if they are taken to refer to some small self-denial! They surely imply that the natural centre of life, self, must be rejected, and that the centre must be thrown outside into something wider. That is the essence of salvation.' And the chief means of breaking away from

the old centre and leading to a new one has been the life and death of Jesus.

Salvation, then, is the taking up of a man's life into the life of Christ, and this works a transformation so profound that such a man, in St. Paul's words which reflect his own experience, is a 'new creation.' The re-centring of the life works a progressive change in thought and habit and character. 'Normally, this involves a conscious acceptance of the leadership and Lordship of Christ. Yet there are lives that make no such acknowledgment, that even reject the claim of Christ, yet indirectly, but none the less solely, owing to His influence, are transformed from self to service. Are they not saved? May they not be the other sheep, not of this fold? May we not find salvation is something far wider than our thought of it?'

Jesus by His life and death of love has so profoundly influenced the thought of the world that He has altered our whole conception of goodness. The 'high-minded' man of Aristotle's ideal, ever conscious of his own superiority, conferring benefits but receiving none, would to-day be universally rejected as a contemptible bounder. 'If Aristotle could return to life, one imagines that a certain word in our tongue would puzzle him more than any other, the word gentleman. That the high-minded man could be gentle would pass Aristotle's understanding. The ideal of the gentle man testifies, as the world itself shows, to Galilee, not Greece. It is just one more indication of the way in which Jesus has turned the thought of the world upside down.'

There is a saying, attributed to Jesus but not recorded in the Bible, which reads, 'Let not him who seeks cease until he finds, and when he finds he shall be astonished, and astonished he shall reach the kingdom.' It appears obviously to be

based on the gospel saying, 'Seek, and ye shall find,' and it serves to emphasize the truth that the quest of God is the deepest quest of human life. For it is the quest of life's supreme value and highest meaning, of the eternal ground and source of life's purpose and power.

Let us not think that we must pursue the quest unaided. It is not of ourselves that we may attain the great mystic certainty. When in obedience to the voice, 'Seek, and ye shall find,' we set out upon the pilgrim way, we but fulfil the human part in the religious life. There is also a Divine part. Man's knowledge of God would be as nothing apart from God's revelation of Himself. We cannot, as it were, wrest God's secrets from Him. In the religious life two spirits co-operate, each seeking to find the other. Human discovery and Divine epiphany go hand in hand.

Yet it should not be forgotten that in the deepest religious experience—such as that of a St. Paul or a St. Augustine, a Luther or a Newman—the sense of being found of God is often so great and overwhelming that one might almost think there had been no seeking or finding of God at all. The deepest religious consciousness is often content to bear wondering witness to the truth that God appears suddenly to lay hold on a man—in the word of our English Bible, to 'apprehend' him. This is the experience to which the poet Francis Thompson gave such eloquent expression in 'The Hound of Heaven,' in which the soul is overtaken and 'apprehended' by the Heavenly Pursuer.

Although it is the testimony of the profounder consciousness of religion that man is found of rather than finds God, we may still say that human discovery and Divine revelation both enter as factors into the religious life. We must seek if we are to find, or even if we are to be found.

Leaders of the Ancient Church.

III.

Tertullian of Carthage.

BY THE REVEREND S. L. GREENSLADE, M.A., OXFORD.

Few things are so striking in the early history of Christianity as the sudden appearance of a vigorous Church in Roman Africa. During the second century the new faith had been spreading rapidly over many parts of the Mediterranean world, but how the message of Christ first reached the shores of what is now Tunisia and Algeria we can only conjecture. The region was one of the greatest granaries of Rome, and among western cities Carthage ranked second only to the imperial capital. Busy ports studded the coast-line, and the multitude of traders from Rome, Alexandria or the East must have included Christians eager to preach the gospel, bringing together the traditions of more than one early centre of Christianity. Ultimately Roman influence was to prevail, for, as may be seen both from literature and from the many monuments uncovered by French excavations, Proconsular Africa and Numidia were more than superficially Romanized in the second and third centuries. It is believed that considerable immigrations from South Italy took place, and towns sprang up rapidly after the Roman pattern. In A.D. 193 Africa gave Rome an emperor, Septimius Severus.

In the main, Christianity followed the lines of Roman influence, reaching Carthage and the coast first, then such parts of the interior as were fairly civilized, and finally, to some small extent, the remoter tribes beyond the limits of Roman authority. Thus Tertullian boasts that missionaries have conquered the Gaetuli and Mauri before the Roman armies. Probably some of the earliest converts were God-fearers or Jews, whose presence in several of the coast cities is well attested. Indeed, Christians shared the Jewish cemetery at Carthage for a time, though friendly relations were broken off before Tertullian wrote his *Adversus Judaeos*. Greeks were numerous along the shore, and at least some of the earlier Christians were Greek-speaking; but essentially the Church was African in character, where 'African' means the new type emerging from the fusion of Latin and Punic stock and civilization. The young Church had to face not only the official Roman cults, but also the enthusiastic worship of Baal-Ammon, Tanit (the 'Juno' of Carthage), Eschmoun,

and a host of Berber deities. It had to establish its doctrinal position against strong heretical movements, especially Gnosticism, and to endure its baptism of blood. Our earliest African document tells how, in A.D. 180, soon after the massacre in Gaul, twelve Christians of Scilli were tried and executed at Carthage. A time of comparative peace followed, until in 202 Severus issued an edict forbidding conversion to Judaism and Christianity. At once the noble death of Perpetua gave rise to the most moving of the Passions, an invaluable authentic document possibly edited by Tertullian himself. For a time we know little of the outward history of the African Church. Tertullian's address to Scapula (A.D. 212) tells of more persecution, in which the Christian cemeteries (open-air *areae*, not catacombs) were attacked by the mob. Incidentally he declares that the governor will find many of his own class, even his own friends, among his victims. By this time the Church was well organized, and about 218 a Council of seventy bishops, including eighteen from Numidia, met at Carthage under Agrippinus and denied the validity of heretical baptism.

This was to be the Church of Cyprian and Augustine and of many lesser but still interesting men, such as Arnobius and Lactantius. First in time and exercising an influence over the rest, and therefore over all subsequent Christianity, which can scarcely be exaggerated, stands Tertullian.

Tertullian was born between A.D. 150 and 160, and, according to Jerome, was the son of a 'pro-consular centurion.'¹ Attempts have been made to identify him with the lawyer Tertullian of the Digest, but this remains uncertain and, on the whole, improbable. His works, however, reveal training in rhetoric and law, together with a wide erudition after the fashion of his time, shallow perhaps and often at second-hand, but ranging over many fields of learning. He was well acquainted with philosophy, himself more or less a Stoic. He had studied medicine to some extent,² and, unlike the

¹ Jer., *de viris ill.*, 53; cf. Tert., *Apol.*, ix. 2, *militia patris nostri* (codex Fuldensis).

² *De Anima*, 2; *Et medicinam inspexi, sororem, ut aiunt, philosophiae.*

strangely scrupulous Cyprian, quotes widely from Greek and Latin authors of every type—poets, philosophers, historians, antiquaries, and even Laberius, the writer of mimes. Perhaps even more important than his education was his temperament. It is hardly possible to define the composite 'African' of his day, nor can we easily decide what in Tertullian is due to his race and what to his individuality. Rome had strengthened or contributed respect for law and authority, Africa a counter-acting intolerance, a passionate vigour which is the source of his power and his weakness. A keen brain, incisive if often tortuous logic, a delight in attack which kept philosophic reflection in subordination, biting sarcasm, and the exuberant rhetoric of his time and country, all were soon to be placed at the service of Christianity.

From the tone of his work as a whole more than from any particular remarks, we may confidently suppose that Tertullian was led to Christianity by two things especially—recognition of its moral achievement, and admiration for its martyrs. He wrote nothing like the *Ad Donatum* of Cyprian to tell us the story of his conversion, but he seems to have reached middle age, and we may suspect that he would not have endured patiently a long period of instruction before taking upon himself first to defend Christianity and then to teach Christians. After a message of encouragement to some imprisoned Christians, Tertullian appears in A.D. 197 as the advocate of his new faith. Within a few months the *Ad Nationes* is refashioned into the far more effective *Apology*, and the defence of Christianity enters upon a new phase. How far Tertullian is wholly original in this depends upon his relation to Minucius Felix, but in any case most of the new spirit is due to him.¹ He draws freely upon Justin and other Greek Apologists, but gives to their main themes, philosophy and the moral charges against Christianity, a comparatively small place. Instead, he takes the offensive, retorts all their charges on the pagans, and attacks their irrational polytheism. Above all, he attacks the injustice of the very laws, and demands that Christians shall not be punished simply as Christians, but for specific crimes after due proof. Then, by anticipation, he defends them against the really weighty charges of enmity to the Roman State. But Tertullian's noble plea to the provincial governors had no effect or a bad one, and he, apparently foreseeing this, himself

turns from all his arguments and in the closing chapters flings defiance. 'Anyhow, our faith is a "*divinum negotium*" and is true; we will die for it, and by martyrdom we shall conquer.'

From pagans he soon turned to Christians, though still intent upon attack. Of the two main subjects of his works, conduct and doctrine, it will be convenient to consider the latter first, since here it makes little difference whether he writes as a Catholic or a Montanist. Tertullian constructed no system, in Origen's sense, but wrote as heretics provoked him. In principle, he thought it unnecessary to answer heresy, and the *De Praescriptione*, expounding this summary condemnation, is one of his most important works. Heretics, he says, argue from Scripture, which is not theirs to use. The books and the right to interpret them belong to the Church of the Apostles, the Church whose preservation of the apostolic faith is guaranteed by the succession of bishops in apostolic sees. By this attitude Tertullian and Irenæus saved historic Christianity from Gnostic mythology and syncretism, though a price had to be paid in the increasing emphasis upon the institutional character of the Church, against which Tertullian was ultimately to rebel. It was becoming possible to be accounted a Christian through acceptance of a *regula fidei* or an ecclesiastical authority. However, Tertullian could not refrain from attacking particular heretics, especially the Gnostics (against Marcion, Hermogenes, the Valentinians, *De Carne Christi*, *De Resurrectione Carnis*, *De Anima*). Using Irenæus and others, but adding much of his own, often unsatisfactory in detail, but strong fundamentally, he established the identity of the God of Creation and Redemption. The Old Testament is organic to the New, history has a meaning and Christ was no sudden, inexplicable portent. Evil is not an eternal principle, but contingent and ultimately to be conquered. The vital struggle against Gnosticism colours nearly all his thought but another challenge, the modalistic Monarchianism of Praxeas, brought forth his important contribution to the doctrine of the Trinity. His background is the Logos doctrine of the Apologists, but Tertullian's scheme is more elaborate and, on its Christological side, more adequate to the reality of the Incarnation. Perhaps the substance of his thought is, in retrospect, less important than his formulæ, for the lawyer in him struggled after precise terms.² Distinguishing carefully, when necessary, between '*substantia*' and '*natura*,' and

¹ J. Martin's opinion, in his edition of the *Octavius*, 1930, that this work is later than the *Quod idola dñi non sint* and therefore than Tertullian, has found much support.

² *Fides nominum salus est proprietatum* (*De Carne Christi*, 13).

using 'persona' with reserve, he works out a statement of the divine 'oconomia.' There is a 'substantia' of divinity and a corresponding 'natura,' the sum of its qualities. Similar objects (e.g. 3 stones) may be of similar nature and substance, but strictly they are only *ejusdem substantiae*. Father, Son and Spirit, however, are more closely united—*unius substantiae*. Yet somehow they are distinct, *unum non unus*, and different in rank or order, though not in power. Usually he calls them simply 'tres' but adds 'personae' when he is forced to it.¹ The most succinct statement deserves quotation: *Tres autem non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie; unius autem substantiae et unius status et unius potestatis, quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formae et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur* (*Prax.*, 2). Tertullian does not quite clearly express the eternal relations of the three Persons. There is some subordinationism, with much also to contradict it, and the Word, though eternally with God, has no real distinctness until the creation of the World. Finally, the Word became flesh. Tertullian's Christology, formally expressed in the work against Praxeas, is to be found substantially in the anti-Gnostic works. The reality of His divinity is assumed, and the debate concerns His humanity. Naturally, against Gnostics, Tertullian has mainly to prove the reality of his flesh, but he shows himself aware that this is not all, and asserts Christ's possession of a true human soul (*De Carne Christi*, 13, and *De Fuga*, 8). Divinity and humanity are combined, without confusion, in one Person. How this can be so is not worked out philosophically any more than it is in his theory of the Trinity, but Tertullian's great influence, exercised largely through Novatian's *De Trinitate*, may be seen by comparing his discussion of *unius substantiae* with the ὁμοούσιος disputes and by setting side by side a passage from *Prax.*, 27, and one from Leo's *Tome*, 3. Tertullian writes '*Videmus duplicem statum non confusum, sed conjunctum in una persona, Deum et hominem Jesum. . . . Et adeo salva est utriusque proprietas substantiae, ut et spiritus res suas egerit in illo, id est virtutes et opera et signa, et caro passionem suas functa est, esuriens*,' etc. Compare Leo: '*Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae et in unam coeunte personam, suscepta est a maiestate humilitas*'; and later, '*verbo operante quod verbi*

est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud succumbit injuriis.'

Among the many doctrines upon which Tertullian touched, none was more decisively influenced than that of the Fall and its consequences. Tertullian is usually described as the forerunner of Augustine, but while this is true historically, there are fundamental differences. It is clear that he differed from the Greeks who discussed the subject before him by stressing the *positive* corruption which human nature has suffered, but he stands with them in his assertion of the freedom of the will. This is because the subject arises most frequently in his dealings with Gnostics, where his principal aim is to prove the contingency of evil. Adam sinned through his free will and thereby his nature was corrupted. This corruption is transmitted physically, *i.e.* seminally, to all his descendants,² and as a result of his inherited weakness all sin. But they do sin actually; they are not guilty simply for Adam's sin. Free will is not annihilated and desire does not become essentially evil. The '*concupiscentium*' is a faculty present in Christ and thus must be a constituent part of unspoilt (*i.e.* for Tertullian, rational) human nature. Further, it is by the exercise of free will that man is to overcome his condition, 'that he might crush his enemy by the same freedom of will by which he had fallen to him, proving the fault to be his own, not God's' (*Adv. Marc.*, ii. 10). Still, in his most ascetic writings, *concupiscentia* in the sense of sexual desire is taken to be bad in itself, which, together with the use of phrases like '*vitium originis*' and '*per collegium transgressionis*,' undoubtedly set speculation upon the road which led to Augustine.

Perhaps the most interesting part of Tertullian's work is his attempt to enforce what he considered the right relations between Christians and pagan society. In this rich and colourful picture of contemporary life, we are given a chance to understand the difficulties of a Christian in a hostile world. We see the Church trying to adjust itself and hear the variety of arguments which one teacher or another produced as each difficult point of conduct arose. All the Apologists had appealed to the superiority of Christian morals to make manifest the value of the Christian faith. Tertullian is passionately anxious that this missionary force shall not lose any of its power. At once he has to ask himself how far the true Christian life can be lived in the world. How much of the

¹ Cf. Augustine, *Trin.*, v. 10, '*Cum quaeritur quid tres, magna prorsus inopia humanum laborat eloquium. Dicitum est tamen tres personae, non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur.*'

² 'Traducianism,' explained in the *De Anima*. Cf. *Test. Anim.*, 3, *traducem damnationis*.

world's values must the Christian renounce? Must he, in fact, 'come out thence'? Tertullian was not the first to ask these questions, but he deals with them much more vigorously and concretely than any one since St. Paul, and, of course, at far greater length. As an Apologist and teacher of Christians at once, he is in something of a dilemma. He must defend Christianity against the charge of being useless to society and disloyal, and so in the *Apology* and *Ad Nationes* he declares that Christians are not withdrawn from the world (*exules vitae*). They enjoy what God has given, they frequent markets, shops, baths, inns, they sail the seas, serve in the army, engage in agriculture and industry. Yet speaking to Christians in the almost contemporary *De Spectaculis* and in later works, he carries to great lengths the claim that Christians must abstain from contact with paganism. This may appear disingenuous, and, indeed, Tertullian's ardour does not always stay to be just or consistent. But the difference in outlook corresponds to the real tension of the time. He wishes to show the Roman authorities that Christianity is not in principle disloyal, and that in practice Christians do all that pagan society will let them. On the other hand, Christians must learn that, however desirable a *modus vivendi* may be, they cannot concede a single point to paganism. In the struggle some were for compromise, and others, perhaps, had comparatively liberal and humanistic views. Tertullian's own bent was towards renunciation, and this was taking the lead long before he became whole-heartedly a Montanist. It is not merely that Christians must abstain from pleasures tainted with paganism, like the public shows. They cannot be soldiers, they can hold no public office, they cannot teach in schools. More even than that, they are cut off from ordinary social contact with pagans and from the usual ways of earning a living, since they must not grow or make or trade in anything which might conceivably be used by some one else in connexion with pagan cults! We must be clear what drives him to so extreme a position. It is not asceticism proper, though that enters into his latest works on celibacy and fasting. Nor does he seem to have thought, like Clement of Alexandria and the monks, that withdrawal from the world is a necessary means to the vision of God. With Tertullian the dominant motive is a missionary one. The moral standard of Christianity must not be allowed to drop, and in particular there must be no concession to idolatry. Not only would Christian prestige suffer where compromise was known, but Christians too are exposed by every

act of idolatry, however remote and indirect, to the attacks of the demons who intercept all worship offered to the non-existent gods of the pagans. This demonology explains why Tertullian's most exhaustive treatise on the Church and the World is entitled '*De Idolatria*.'

Tertullian's demands met with an opposition which drove him to Montanism, the Phrygian movement of enthusiasm which was struggling for acceptance in Rome and had evidently become known in Africa.¹ From about 207 onwards his works show this influence, and about 213 there must have been an open breach with the Catholics. A sect of Tertullianists lingered on into the time of Augustine. If the change appears extraordinary in one who had so strenuously vindicated the authority of the Church, we should recognize how hard he was pressed. Many found methods of compromise which could be reconciled with their consciences, while to much that he urged, common sense remained deaf. The distinction between the precepts and counsels of the gospel was gaining ground, and is occasionally sanctioned by Tertullian himself. The idea of the Church as a school rather than a community of the well-nigh perfect found favour with authority. Tertullian frequently found the clergy against him, as in the question of military service, and his rage reached its climax at the final betrayal when Callistus, the Bishop of Rome, relaxed the penitential system, and received back into communion those guilty of adultery.² Montanism provided a defence against all this. Its demands were high and the double standard was finally swept away. Already in the fairly early *Ad Uxorem*, i. 3, he had written: '*Praelatio superiorum dissuasio est infimorum . . . secundus solatium habet, victoriam non habet.*' In Montanism, only those who accept the highest standard are Christians at all. Again, he could now turn from the ecclesiastical authority which he had previously supported to that of the Spirit and spiritual persons. From the most curious ravings of an inspired prophetess there was no appeal. Only a tremendous moral passion could have brought the argumentative lawyer into such company.

Can we penetrate to Tertullian's personal religion? Harnack has described him as an old-fashioned Christian (a form of praise), but condemned his legalism. Rashdall strongly censured his hard, profit-and-loss moralism. It is not that he is cold

¹ Tertullian's *De Ecstasi*, a long defence of Montanism mentioned by Jerome, is no longer extant.

² The orthodox *De Paenitentia* should be compared with the Montanist *De Pudicitia*.

or insincere, for there is fire in all his work. But is there any graciousness, anything to love in the man? Does he really *depend* on God in the deepest sense of religion? Or is his God simply a *deus philosophorum*? It is not easy to assemble the evidence for an answer. He believes firmly that God has revealed Himself to His creation, and that man owes Him the service of the loftiest possible conduct. We must not forget that morality is no unimportant part of true religion, but sympathy weakens when we find Tertullian not scrupling to say that moral achievement makes God man's debtor. To what unspiritual consequences was the doctrine of merit to lead! The absence of treatises on the Atonement and Grace is not necessarily significant, since neither was called for at a time when divergence of opinion on these subjects was not dubbed heresy. He certainly thought that the world had been saved by nothing but Christ's death, and if he produced no particular theory of the Atonement, his emphasis on the Death rather than the Incarnation was to have effect on Western theology.¹ Baptism was of great importance to him as the way in which the effect of the Cross is mediated, and the forgiveness of sins secured. He believed that he was given a fresh start and need no longer fall back. Undoubtedly in his view moral progress after baptism is due to man's own will, to which the thought of grace is completely subordinated. However, he found in the Eucharist a true food of the spirit, and in the *De Paenitentia* he suggests that God's grace somehow affects the choice which is actually made freely. This tentative recognition of the ultimate Divine initiative is strengthened by one unusual statement—'the force of divine grace, mightier than nature, having in subjection to itself the free power of choice in us' (*De Anima*, 21). Above all, Tertullian believes in prayer. Christians pray at all times, and for true prayer a pure heart, modesty, and humility are necessary. Tertullian knows his own deficiencies, and disarms criticism when he speaks of patience. 'I confess to the Lord God that it is rash, if not shameless, of me to write about patience.' Closing the *De Baptismo* he says, 'One thing I ask, that when you pray you may remember Tertullian, a sinner.'

Much more should be said of his sources,² of his attitude to philosophy, tradition, and scripture, his theory of the Church, and his milleniarism. He left

few subjects untouched, and if he did not always adorn them, he stirred up thought about them all. It must be remembered that Tertullian was the first *Latin* theologian of any importance. Jerome puts him first after Victor, but we know little now of that Pope's '*mediocria volumina*.' The African Church was in part Greek-speaking, perhaps entirely so at first; but Latin soon predominated, so that while Rome still used Greek officially, Tertullian, the spokesman of a Latin Church, was creating the theological language of the West. This language, the vehicle of a style impossible either to describe or to resist, is constantly under investigation, and opinion has moved far since the days when its peculiarities were simply called Africanisms. Doubtless something was due to provincial usages, something even to Punic influence; but, apart from the mark of the Greek Bible, we must look for affinities with Tertullian's vocabulary, grammar and syntax to Plautus, Varro and Petronius, in fact to that popular language which, driven underground by the classical poets and orators but always spoken, was once more legitimized in literature when Christians were determined to be 'understood of the people.' Rhetoric of course remained, particularly in Cyprian's works, but the popular element invigorated it, and Augustine said he would rather make mistakes of grammar than not be understood. It was also in Tertullian's time and country that the Bible was first translated into Latin. He may himself have made some of the earliest experiments, for his citations are not at all uniform, whereas a typical African text had been established by the time of Cyprian. If this is true, the West must acknowledge another great debt to him.

A first impression of Tertullian might be very misleading. Difficulties of style, tortuous arguments, inconsistencies, unfair judgments, perverse exegesis, and strident denials of common sense meet us at every turn, besides the more deeply-seated faults which have been mentioned. But perseverance is rewarding, for no one can long be blind to the creative power and earnestness of his genius at one of the most interesting times in the history of Christianity. Tertullian's influence on the doctrines of the Trinity, the Person of Christ, and the Fall has already been described. Little known in the East (though Eusebius had a Greek translation of the Apology), the heretic was not often named even in the West, but he was read freely either at first-hand or, if one may put it so, in Cyprian and Novatian. According to a familiar story of Jerome's, Cyprian called him 'the master,'

¹ Cf. *Totum Christiani nominis et pondus et fructus, mors Christi* (*Adv. Marc.*, iii. 8).

² Undoubtedly he learnt much from Irenæus and the Gnostics themselves. His relation to Clement of Alexandria needs thorough investigation.

and conned his works daily. When Cyprian denied the validity of heretical baptism he took his stand on African custom and might have appealed to Tertullian's *De Baptismo* as a witness of it. Sometimes he follows him closely, as in the *De Habitu Virginum*, *De Bono Patientiae*, and, if it is Cyprian's, *Quod Idola Dii non sint*. Much more slavish is the imitation in certain anonymous works of the time (e.g. *De Spectaculis* and *De Bono Pudicitiae*), for Cyprian himself usually assimilates Tertullian's teaching to his own statesmanlike spirit, so that in Benson's words, 'We largely owe our very possession of Tertullian to Cyprian's appreciation of him and rendering of his thoughts into so quiet and so

sweet a style.¹ Novatian owed much to him, and so did Augustine, largely through Cyprian. Jerome is full of him, and Vincent of Lerins speaks of him with the highest praise. Later he was not much known, so that, unhappily, manuscripts are few. But one work of great importance, Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, grew out of the current of thought started by Tertullian's theory of merit and satisfaction. Probably he is not much read to-day at first-hand, but his influence lives through other men. However much the intrinsic value of his teaching may be outgrown, the stimulus he gave to Christian thought and literature remains an achievement which few have equalled.

Literature.

THE FORMATION OF THE GOSPEL TRADITION.

PROFESSOR VINCENT TAYLOR, Ph.D., D.D., has done a new thing of the very first importance for the English-speaking world of critical New Testament scholarship in his book, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). He has given us an evaluation of the Form-criticism (*Form-geschichte*) which has recently been so vigorously pursued on the Continent, and among German scholars in particular. This is an attempt to get behind the Gospel records in their present form to the period of their first tentative oral beginnings—from A.D. 30 to 50—and to watch their growth from separate pronouncement-stories (the point of which is some great word which Jesus is reported to have uttered), sayings and parables, miracle stories, and stories about Jesus. These, it is held, first came into being in granulated fashion as separate entities, were then gathered, largely for mnemonic purposes, into strings or collections having a topical similarity, and finally woven into continuous Gospels. These pericopæ were the work of preachers, narrators, missionaries, teachers. According to this new school of criticism, they are community-products of primitive Christianity which put back its own ideas and beliefs into the lips of Jesus. 'The critical results of this method are radical in the extreme; of the historical little or nothing is left.'

Dr. Taylor, while ready to see the value of this

method of criticism, makes a searching analysis of its defects, its tendency to ignore the creative activity of the original Speaker of the great sayings; its tendency to consider the primitive community as existing *in vacuo*, 'cut off from its founders by the walls of an inexplicable ignorance'; its ignoring of the memories of eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses. If the stories are products of Christian imagination, form-criticism does not explain why they do not increase in number as time passes. It credits the first Christians with 'a facility for invention and an imagination always at command.'

Dr. Taylor is convinced that we ought rather to esteem the pronouncement stories as among the strongest and most stable elements in the Gospel tradition. Again, he says that there is in the great majority of the sayings attributed to Jesus a self-authenticating note which stamps them as His, and not the formations of the community. Again, as regards the miracle-stories, 'the incidental way in which they tell of the "mighty works" is the best evidence that Jesus wrought them.' 'Jesus does not heal to awaken faith, because He assumes it.'

So the method, while valuable as showing how the stories originated, and how 'many stories of invaluable interest to the modern man . . . had no chance of survival because they knocked in vain at the doors of communal faith,' yet does not discredit the narratives as history. It may show how certain accretions have crept into the stories, but 'it is one thing to say that symbolism shines

through a story of fact, quite another thing to say symbolism is clothing itself with the garb of reality.'

Dr. Taylor's study is on the whole reassuring. We may be confident that we still have in large measure the chronological order of Christ's ministry in Mark's Gospel, and that the credibility of the Gospel facts is not seriously impaired by the new critical method. We have reason to be grateful that the Form-criticism has been introduced to us by such sane and competent scholarship as Dr. Taylor's.

JESUS AND OURSELVES.

The Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead's new book, *His Life and Ours* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), is an earnest and edifying review of the Life of Jesus in its main 'moments.' The sub-title is 'The Significance for us of the Life of Jesus,' and accurately describes the chief purpose of the book. For the most part the writer follows the track of Jesus' ministry, and, selecting its salient features, gives us first a picture of the Master as He appeared at that particular point, and then brings home to us the bearing of this on ourselves. In this he is conspicuously successful. The picture is vividly drawn, and the 'application' is always helpful. The spirit of the book is really beautiful, and the passionate devotion to Jesus (the adjective is not too strong) shown throughout is very moving.

The same whole-hearted praise cannot be given to the few chapters in which the writer deals with the great issues raised by the life of Jesus, the chapters on the Incarnation and on the Death of Jesus, and, in a lesser degree, that on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Frankly, it is difficult to know where Mr. Weatherhead stands in regard to the Person of Christ. He uses the word 'deity' of Jesus, and he also says, 'Deity in Jesus means that He is a perfect revelation of God.' But that is not deity as the word is commonly understood. Again, he says: 'I believe that because of His perfect reaction to God and against sin He gradually attained consciousness that He was in a unique sense the Son of God,' and so His sonship was both an achievement and a revelation. Throughout the chapter on the Incarnation we see with admiration an earnest mind grappling with the biggest problems raised by the Gospels. We follow his exploration with intense interest, but it is not quite clear where we come out. Mr. Weatherhead is modern enough to dispense with the Virgin Birth as the basis of Divinity, but he also seems disposed to adhere to the theological construction

of the great creeds. He clings to the Deity of Christ, but he says, 'Personally, if I were asked if I believed in the Trinity I would rather keep silent.' We greatly appreciate such a manful effort as we find here to grasp the reality in Jesus Christ. And, even if this book is not a very sure guide in that lofty region, it will make Jesus more real and more worshipful, and that is the sure way to find God in Him.

LEVITICUS.

The Chief Rabbi has followed up his volumes on Genesis and Exodus by one on *Leviticus* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), on the same scale and in the same style. Interest in Leviticus has been to some extent driven into the background by the modern critical view which tends to accentuate the contribution of the prophet to the literature of revelation, often to the depreciation of that of the priest; and it is all to the good to have so sane a discussion of this important book from so competent an authority on matters Jewish as Dr. Hertz. The nature of the book obliged him to face both the documentary theory of the Pentateuch and the attitude of the prophets to sacrifice. On both these topics he speaks in no uncertain tones. The whole documentary theory, he tells us, rests on unproved assumptions, and the idea of a 'Priestly Code' and of its late origin is nothing more than pure hypothesis. (To Robertson, Orr, Wiener, and other defenders of the 'orthodox' position named on p. 317, he might have added W. Möller on 'Die Einheit und Echtheit der 5 Bücher Mosis,' 1931.) Again, the prophets, he argues, offer no absolute condemnation of sacrifice, it is the sacrifice of the wicked that is an abomination to the LORD (Pr 15⁸). He usefully supplements this discussion by brief chapters on 'The Rabbis and the Sacrificial Cult' and on 'The Jewish Interpretation of Sacrifice.' On the famous verse Lev 19¹⁸, which he describes as the Golden Rule in Judaism, he argues that *rea* means neighbour of whatever race or creed, fellow-man and not simply fellow-Israelite, and that this verse is a genuine anticipation of the Golden Rule of Jesus. But, however one may differ from Dr. Hertz on these and other matters, one can have nothing but commendation for the book as a whole, which is a fine and informing commentary on a little known book of the Bible, written by one who combines with his devotion to Judaism a generous appreciation of all the relevant literature, whether written by Jews or not. The text is printed on fine paper,

the Hebrew on the right, the English (R.V.) on the left, and the notes at the foot. The book is a joy to handle, and there could be no more convenient way to study Leviticus. The value of the book is increased by the addition of the Haftorahs to Leviticus—from Samuel, Kings, Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Malachi.

CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS.

In a text-book entitled *The Christian Faith* (Macmillan; 20s. net), Dr. Joseph Stump, President of North-Western Lutheran Theological Seminary, seeks to present the doctrines of the Lutheran Church on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, in consonance with the Lutheran Confessions, and in the language of to-day. Such technical terms as have obtained a fixed place in Dogmatics are retained and defined, but the constant aim has been—and in it the writer has succeeded—to present the doctrines as simply and clearly as possible.

The work follows the usual lines of a text-book on Dogmatics, treating of the doctrines of the Christian Faith in the so-called logical order. Its four parts are: (1) God and Man, and the Alienation through Sin, (2) The Reconciliation and Redemption by Jesus Christ, (3) The Work of the Holy Spirit, (4) The Last Things; or, The Consummation of Redemption. The standpoint is conservative, but it is not conservatism of the deepest dye. It is of too deep a hue, however, for the taste of most modern readers. It is enough to mention that the first and third chapters of Genesis appear to be accepted as historical documents. But if the modern theologian has reacted from the standpoint here adopted, he will find in the work many lucid and useful expositions of the ecclesiastical tradition on the various points of doctrine.

The Lutheran positions on the Person and States of Christ, on Justification, and on the Sacraments find in President Stump a faithful interpreter. Perhaps in view of the usual references of Calvinists to the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence, the following words are worth citing: 'The Lutheran Church does not teach the doctrine of consubstantiation, though she has frequently been accused of teaching it. This doctrine means that the bread and the wine are combined with the body and blood of Christ into a third substance. Nor does the Lutheran Church teach the doctrine of impanation or of subpanation, that is, that the body and blood are locally included or enclosed in the bread and wine, or are located under them. Her

teaching is that the body and blood of Christ are not locally but sacramentally connected with the bread and the wine; and that only during the actual reception of the communicant are the body and blood present. Before and after the actual administration the bread and the wine are only bread and wine.'

PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

Fulfilling the Ministry (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net), by the late Dr. S. K. Knight, Bishop of Jarrow, is based upon the Cambridge Pastoral Theology Lectures, 1925-1926. In the Introduction Dr. Herbert Hensley Henson, Lord Bishop of Durham, recalls that the late Dr. Knight was a man of tireless industry and great personal devotion, and that he was conspicuously successful in his exercise of the pastoral office. That in itself would be no guarantee that this is a good book on its subject. But when it is added that he was a man of studious habits and of wide reading, we are disposed to turn to his pages in hope. Nor should our hopes be disappointed.

The range of the book is well indicated in the titles of its eight sections—The Faith, the Church of England, Priests, Prophets, Pastors, Teachers, Study, Fulfilling the Ministry. Special emphasis is given to the ways in which the clergy must present the Faith they have to teach, the ideals which should animate them in their pastoral work, and the means by which they may hope to maintain and develop their own faith and to sanctify their own life.

Dr. Knight encouraged the young clergyman to be alert to the movements in modern thought. He is of opinion that, so long as the essential content of the Faith is preserved, its traditional form may be abandoned. Indeed, he appears to desiderate a re-interpretation of the Faith which shall correspond with a vital Christianity. We must, as he says, 'hear the Church,' but it must be the living Church of God as it reflects and develops the Divine revelation which it is still receiving.

The section on Study has probably the most general appeal. We notice with interest that Dr. Knight regards Hastings' 'Dictionary of the Bible,' the 'Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,' and the 'Dictionary of the Apostolic Church' as 'invaluable' for the clergy; and to these he adds, the 'Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics,' 'edited by the same scholar.' He makes an appeal to the country clergy in particular to help to preserve 'that place in theology, scholarship, and literature

which for generations has belonged to the clergy of the Church of England.'

We commend this book very heartily as a wise, earnest, and informative guide to the duties of the pastoral office, particularly in the Anglican Communion.

THE HOLY GHOST.

The Rev. Canon Peter Green, M.A., has completed a trilogy, the two other parts of which were 'Our Heavenly Father' and 'Our Lord and Saviour,' by the publication of *The Holy Ghost: The Comforter* (Longmans; 3s. net in paper, 4s. 6d. net in cloth). This is a full-flavoured, and thoroughly orthodox exposition of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It is both devout and intelligent. The Canon knows where he stands, but he also knows where other people stand, and both outsiders and perplexed and hesitating believers will find help in this book. Many people, for example, are puzzled by the fact that they cannot distinguish between an experience of God the Father and an experience of God the Son, and still more both of these from an experience of the Holy Spirit. Canon Green says this is not strange, because the Three Persons are One, and all religious experience is experience of One God. There is no *distinct* experience of one or other. To many people this simple explanation will bring real relief. And the writer is generally in touch with reality in this fashion. One of the most attractive aspects of the book is Canon Green's use of analogy, in which his mind is very fertile. There is a particularly fine example of this on p. 94, taken from the broadcasting of music, which is not only fine but religiously illuminating. It is bracing to witness, as we do here, a really religious mind exploring the deep things of God, and if the mind is not of the first class, it is the mind of a man deeply in earnest and with a good outfit both of ability and scholarship.

A STUDY IN MONASTICISM.

Scottish Abbeys and Social Life (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net) is the most recent addition to the 'Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought.' The author is Mr. G. G. Coulton, Litt.D., F.B.A., Cambridge University Lecturer in English, who is the Editor of the series. His work is a revised and greatly amplified edition of the Rhind Lectures delivered at Edinburgh in 1931. It is specially concerned with the tracing

of similarities and differences between Scottish monasticism and that of the rest of Europe, and the influence of the Monastic Orders upon civilization and social life. The volume is illustrated with six plates and fourteen text-figures.

Dr. Coulton believes that monasticism was one of the great formative forces in the social life of the Middle Ages, and that in the twelfth century it did more than anything else to bring Scotland into line with general European civilization. But monasticism in Scotland changed rapidly in character. 'For good or for evil, while the monk impressed himself upon the world, society also impressed itself upon the monk.' One result was that he who might almost be said to have begun as an anti-capitalist became definitely a capitalist.

Dr. Coulton also believes that even at the times of worst decay the average monk was leading a more regular life than the average outsider. This surely we should expect to find. The unredeemed world outside the monastery was rough enough in England, and, apparently, rougher still in Scotland. A dark picture has come down to us of the corruption against which Aelred struggled in Galloway.

The range of this learned and most interesting work is indicated in the titles of some of its chapters—Celtic Monachism, The Monastic Rules, Monastic Revenues, How Endowments Came, Charity, Monks and Parishes, Monk and Peasant, Monastic Housekeeping, Schools, Art and Learning, Visitation. Even the most unpromising titles yield in Dr. Coulton's hand matter of lively human interest. His pages make rich and piquant fare for students of monastic history.

Dr. Coulton finds himself opposed to many traditional views concerning monks and monasteries. He warns us against the frequent exaggerations of modern writers with regard to the monks' indirect services towards the poor; the medieval standard of poor relief or hospital treatment would not satisfy the world of to-day. He warns us against the picture drawn by educated modern readers of the monks as most often, next to the Church, in the scriptorium; to counterbalance that view he quotes the *obiter dictum* of a distinguished medievalist, that the monastic scriptorium was 'as mythical as Mrs. Harris.' He warns us that far fewer records were written in the medieval monasteries, and those were far less carefully preserved, than is commonly believed; that documentary evidence dictates serious modifications of the popular view regarding the prevalence of monastic schools; and that there is little evidence for monastic learning in Scotland, apart from the ordinary routine of

church services and ritual. There is abundant matter here for controversy.

A MACDONALD IN TIBET.

The vast territory of Tibet 'on the roof of the world' is no longer an unknown country. The explorer, the missionary, the British-India military and civil officers, the scholar, have all been there, and the history of Tibet, the manners and customs and religion of its people have been made plain. Colonel Waddell's 'Lhasa and its Mysteries' and Sir Francis Younghusband's 'India and Tibet' were revelations no longer ago than the beginning of this century. These have been followed by 'The Land of the Lama,' by Mr. David Macdonald, a member of the Indian Civil Service, who has now given in a fuller narrative his intimate experiences in *Twenty Years in Tibet* (Seeley, Service; 18s. net). Mr. Macdonald, whose father was a Scotsman and his mother a native of Sikkim on the border of Tibet, was appointed, by the Government of India, British Trade Agent in Tibet, a post he filled from 1905 till his retirement in 1925. This was an eventful period in the troubled history of this little-known country, dominated for a long time by the Chinese. His proficiency in Tibetan secured for him an appointment as member of the first British Mission under Sir Francis Younghusband which visited Lhasa. It was very doubtful what would be the nature of the reception of the Mission. The Dalai Lama, the Head or Pope of the Tibetan religion, and most of the nobles and princes of the Church as well as the better class people had fled from Lhasa on the approach of the Expedition, as dreadful tales of ferocity and cruelty had been in circulation. After a few days the people realized that these were unfounded. The British tommy and the Indian sepoy were soon wandering from shop to shop, a never-ending source of interest. Mr. Macdonald found the common people among the Tibetans during all his experience extraordinarily friendly and always ready to help him and his family. 'The Tibetan is a likeable fellow, always cheery, with a song on his lips, and will do anything. He has no caste prejudices like the Hindu, . . . will turn his hand to everything, and with a little teaching will do good work.' 'It is a fact that, as far as outward observation of religious matters and practices goes, the Tibetans are a deeply religious people. Their whole lives are bound up in their faith.' Mr. Macdonald during his sojourns saw a good deal of the Dalai Lama. 'He told me, one day, that what

had impressed him as much as anything during his wanderings in exile was the fact that wherever there were British people there was a church, and from this observation he concluded that . . . therefore they and the Tibetans, who were a like-minded race, should always be in harmony.' Mr. Macdonald has had a wealth of experience. He writes not only with intimate knowledge but with sympathy. The book is illustrated with numerous photographs and there is an excellent map.

Jesus after Nineteen Centuries, by the Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle, D.D. (Abingdon Press; \$2.00), is the Yale Lectures on Preaching for 1932, but it is somewhat notably different from previous volumes in that distinguished series. It contains a vigorous application of certain features of the teaching of Jesus to the problems of the hour. It is written from the humanist point of view, and there is more of discursive treatment of the present world crisis than of close study of the Gospels. Some of Dr. Tittle's political criticisms will seem to European readers to be based on imperfect information and to involve somewhat hasty judgments. The strength of the book lies in its exposition of the Christian law of love and non-resistance of evil. On this topic Dr. Tittle writes sanely and persuasively, and his manifest enthusiasm for peace and goodwill among men is most stimulating.

What the League of Nations has most to fear is lack of public support. The two great underminers of public support are pessimism and cynicism. We regret that the pessimist and the cynic have been provided with so much pabulum in Max Beer's book, now given English dress by Mr. W. H. Johnston in *The League on Trial: A Journey to Geneva* (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net).

Outspoken Addresses, by the Rev. Percival Gough, M.A. (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net), contains about a dozen addresses which deal with Christian truth in its contact with the problems of to-day. In these addresses there is nothing startlingly outspoken, but they are honest, straightforward talks on such topics as Science and Religion, Spiritualism, the Christian Doctrine of God, the Guidance of Christ, and an Ideal Church, and are eminently fitted to bring real help and inspiration to souls in perplexity.

The Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D., Stanton Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion in the University of

Cambridge, is issuing a series entitled 'Modern Handbooks on Religion.' We have before us Nos. 2, 3, and 4—*Religious Experience: Its Nature, Types, and Validity; Phases of the Christian Church: A Short View of its History; and The World we Live In* (Heffer; No. 2, 3s. net; No. 3, 4s. net; and No. 4, 2s. 6d. net). As a rule it does not conduce to confidence when, in these days of highly specialised knowledge, a writer undertakes too wide a field. Judging, however, from the little books before us, we are impressed with Dr. Bouquet's competence. They will serve as admirable introductions.

The day is past, we hope, when the missionary was regarded as an unpractical idealist whose only aim was to fill the bewildered minds of primitive peoples with theological doctrines. He is now recognized as the most advanced and versatile pioneer of Christian civilization. In Africa particularly the value of missionary educational work has come to be fully acknowledged in Government circles. *School Paths in Africa*, by Phyllis L. Garlick (Highway Press; 1s. net), gives a charming account of everyday life in African village schools. It ought to be widely read, not only for the interest of the story, but for its power to awaken sympathy and stir enthusiasm for the missionary cause.

Two discussions have reached us from the pen of Professor Solomon Zeitlin. One is *An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia). In this he argues that the Book of Ezekiel was never threatened with exclusion from the Canon, and that the word קַנְיָן, the usage of which he illustrates profusely, does not really imply this. He further argues that the canonization of the Hagiographa did not take place till A.D. 65, and that Ecclesiastes and Esther were added later. He concludes by offering reasons why Jubilees, Ben Sira, Tobit, Judith, and Susanna were not included in the Canon.

The subject of his other discussion is *The Am Haarez* (Dropsie College, Philadelphia). In this he argues that in early tannaitic literature this much-disputed phrase denotes the farmers who tilled the soil. It was this group that had to maintain the Priests and Levites entirely at their own expense. The urban population, which was very considerable—as, after the Maccabean revolt, cities on the coast were added to Judea either by conquest or penetration—had no share in this maintenance. This gave rise to bitter animosity between the two classes. The cleavage between them grew. The Jewish

State became divided between the *Haaberim*, the privileged classes, the patricians, and the *Am Haarez*, the tillers of the soil, the plebeians. The differentiation between the two classes became eventually not only social and economic but cultural, and *Am Haarez* became synonymous with ignorance. The essay concludes, however, with the admission that in tannaitic literature this term may be interpreted in various ways, and its exact meaning has to be determined by the context.

A very sound and interesting book of Christian Apologetics has been written by the Rev. R. G. Legge, the vicar of St. Mark's Parish Church, Victoria Park, London—*Christian Theism in Contemporary Thought*. We give the writer's full address because the book is published by himself, and can be procured for 2s. 6d. net. It is to be followed by one on Anti-theistic theories, and another on The Person of Christ. If the others are as good as the first they will be well worth the modest price charged. For this book on theism is based on wide reading and careful thinking. Most of the great works that have appeared during the last few years have been laid under contribution, and it is a creditable fact that a busy parish priest should be able to produce so good a book as this in the midst of his many duties. All relevant aspects of theism are dealt with here, and many of the hardest problems faced.

Dr. Alington, Headmaster of Eton, has already given us two admirable books of popular apologetic which have been praised as they deserved in these columns. He has now followed them with another which is in its way just as useful. It is unhappily named, *The Fool Hath Said* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). The author uses the word 'fool' in no contemptuous sense, but as applied to any one who makes unconsidered statements on a subject about which he knows very little. All the same no one likes to be called a fool even in that modified sense, and the title will greatly hinder the book's acceptance. That is a pity, for it is a book much needed and very well done. Dr. Alington takes a number of 'silly' statements, like 'It does not matter what a man believes so long as he lives a good life,' or 'foreign missions are a waste of energy,' or 'you need not go to church to be a religious man,' and analyses them in a candid and courteous fashion. In other words this little book is good apologetic, because it is a sensible and able man's reply to criticisms of religion and the Church that have a wide vogue with people who

do not think. There is an excellent introduction by Dean Inge.

The Inner Advent, by the Rev. James Colville, M.A. (Lutterworth Press; rs. 6d. net), is a series of brief studies of the spiritual life. Some of these have already appeared in religious journals, but they are of sufficient value to merit being gathered into more permanent form. They are thoughtful meditations, rich in practical counsel and uplifting in tone.

Whatever may be thought of the philosophy of some American writers on philosophical topics, there is no denying that many of them have been singularly successful in making the subject interesting and in presenting it in facile literary style. There can be no doubt that Mr. W. T. Stace, Litt.D., of Princeton, is at once a brilliant writer and a real thinker. His book, *The Theory of Knowledge and Existence* (Milford; 18s. net), is a work of scholarship, fascinatingly written. It aims at exhibiting knowledge as a logical development from its primitive certitudes up to its highest achievements in science. By means of 'mental constructions' a coherent and intelligible world is built up. These mental constructions are analysed and justified in a very masterly way. On the 'solipsistic' basis, which Dr. Stace assumes, his argument is not only brilliant, it is unanswerable. But is solipsism a satisfactory assumption? Is our knowledge actually so built up? In his explanation, ingenious as it is, of how we come to be convinced that an object we leave continues in existence in our absence, the author gives no place to the fact that the lower animals show that they share in the same conviction.

Professor Benjamin B. Warfield of Princeton was an outstanding figure in American Theology, and his literary Remains were worth disinterment from Dictionaries, Encyclopædias, and Magazines. That pious task is being undertaken by a Committee, and we are in receipt of the tenth and last volume, *Critical Reviews* (Milford; 20s. net). Almost half a hundred Reviews constitute a handsome volume. The Reviews deal with publications issued between 1893 and 1920. Thirty years is a longish period in a man's life. It is a much longer period in a scholar's life. We have read carefully the earlier and the later Reviews, interested to discover, if we could, how Dr. Warfield's mind had developed. We have failed to discover any trace of any modification whatsoever. To those who

belong to the school of theological thought of which Warfield next to Hodge was the outstanding leader and exponent that will probably be a most meritorious thing. Others, like ourselves, will have our doubts.

Of the books reviewed one or two have been long forgotten; others have had their value assessed by Time, the one trustworthy critic. We cannot see what real benefit to any one lies in the preservation of Dr. Warfield's criticism of them when they appeared. Such a work as this is useful mainly as a revelation of the views of the critic; and as we have indicated, these are given by half a dozen as effectively as by the half hundred offered.

We have received *The Road to Immortality* (Nicholson & Watson; 6s. net). It is a description of the after-life purporting to be communicated by the late F. W. H. Myers through Geraldine Cummins, and a foreword is contributed by Sir Oliver Lodge. We quite agree with that distinguished scientist that 'the accounts given of the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh States are remarkable'; we would add that the description of the Seventh State is very remarkable, seeing that (if we understand him aright) Mr. Myers has not yet reached it.

The Passionate Pilgrim, by the Rev. John M'Neill (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net), contains twelve sermons selected from the 'Regent Square Pulpit.' They are reprinted as they were preached in Regent Square forty years ago, yet they are singularly alive and apposite. To older readers they will reawaken memories of John M'Neill at the height of his power. Even in the printed page there is enough of the old fire to set hearts aflame.

The latest 'Lettice Bell' book is *Our Good-Night Book* (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net). It is a wonderful book at the price, beautifully bound and charmingly illustrated. The stories are for quite young people, and are told with simplicity and a concrete directness that suit them admirably for their purpose. A big book that is light to hold, well printed, and delightful to look at.

Another book for the young, just as good in its way, is *Eastertide Stories*, by Bertha C. Krall (National Sunday School Union; 1s. net). It contains some really beautiful allegories from various hands, among others Basil Mathews and William J. May. The tales are all marked with a letter indicating for what age each one is suited. Beginners, Primary, Junior, or Intermediate

scholars. This is a book that will be very useful both to parents and teachers.

The Rev. Lionel B. Fletcher has prepared a new and revised edition of his *Effective Evangelism* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d. net), which was first published in 1923. It is a book which every minister should read and ponder. It is extraordinarily sane, and every page bears evidence of ripe experience and good taste. For practical usefulness to the workaday minister it is worth a cartload of those lectures on preaching that pour monotonously from the Press. If studied and taken to heart it might well lead to a revival of gospel preaching and make the ministry of many a discouraged man a new and living thing.

From Cedar to Hyssop: A Study in the Folklore of Plants in Palestine, by Mrs. Grace M. Crowfoot and Miss Louise Baldensperger (Sheldon Press; 6s. net), is a book to describe and commend. Only some one with the same learning, and (impossibly) the same long experience of Palestine and its life as these two ladies possess between them could fully appreciate the merits of this volume. Into it have been packed the lore of Miss Baldensperger, who for many years has lived among the plants and flowers of Palestine, and the skilled pen and scholarship of Mrs. Crowfoot, and the result is impressive in a high degree. Corn, wine and oil, wild foods, plants with folk uses, medicinal plants, sacred trees and magical plants, all have contributed as material for these experts, and we have many of the old tales connected with them. The book is profusely illustrated with photographs and drawings of scenes and plants. No praise could be too great for an achievement which cannot have many parallels.

An unusual kind of book for Lenten reading is *Lent: A Manual for the Clergy* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net).

The authors are numerous, including Dr. Masterman, Bishop of Plymouth, Professor Grensted, the Rev. K. D. Mackenzie, and others. The most interesting parts of the book are a long essay of thirty pages on 'Fasting: Its History and Uses,' and an excellent essay by Professor Grensted on 'Modern Methods of presenting the Doctrine of the Atonement,' which is really helpful as well as sensible. There is also an article by the Rev. K. D. Mackenzie on 'Anglican Adaptations of Latin Rites and Ceremonies,' shortened from 'Liturgy and Worship' which was published last year and reviewed in these columns. The main part of the book, and the most 'useful' for certain purposes, is devoted to sermon outlines and suggestions which are quite good in their way. They ought to be, since most of them seem to have been furnished by the Bishop of Plymouth. A note on Lenten Reading by Dr. Eck concludes a volume which has something for everybody and most of it very good.

They Do Not Die, by Mr. Charles A. Hall (Williams & Norgate; 3s. net), is a little book written in support of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. The writer bases his argument 'on rational grounds: the appeal is to Reason, not to Authority.' He writes with ardent conviction and a manifest desire to bring comfort to the bereaved and assurance to the doubtful. While making free use of the concept of the love of God, he paints a picture of the future life very similar to the conditions of the present world. 'John Smith is the same John Smith in the spirit-world; his journey there, by way of death, has not changed him any more than a trip to America.' It is difficult to see any adequate reason why John Smith should meander on in the same old way through the ages of eternity. In the whole conception of the book there is a singular failure to grasp the magnitude of the subject or to feel the solemn mystery of the eternal.

The Strangest 'Word' of Jesus.

BY THE REVEREND FRED SMITH, NEWTON, KANSAS, U.S.A.

PERHAPS the strangest word ever uttered by Jesus was that which broke from His lips on the Cross: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' I say the strangest because theologians have made it so. The usual explanations of this sentence are

familiar to all. For the sake of conciseness I borrow my references from the article by the late Professor David Smith, in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. Here, in the article entitled 'Dereliction,' we are informed that the explanation of the

cry has been sought mainly along two lines. First, '*Jesus was standing in the room of sinners and enduring vicariously the wrath of God.*' In one sentence the learned writer dismisses this: 'This opinion is at once unscriptural and irrational.' The other explanation is that '*Jesus was not really forsaken by God, but His soul was clouded by the anguish of His flesh and spirit, and His faith, hitherto victorious, gave way.*' If this viewpoint is the generally accepted one in our time, I, for my part, have to say that it seems 'at once unscriptural and irrational.' Others may write the word 'dereliction' in connexion with an episode in the Master's life, but not I. The Christ I serve must know the nearness of God all the way. To have Him say, at any moment of experience, that God has forsaken Him is to make Him less than the Christ. Sin, all men's sin, must not be so thick a darkness but that Christ can see through it.

I know (for I have the experience) that when I begin to say these things there are many ready to knock me down, metaphorically, and call it 'coming to the defence of the faith.' It is not my task here to use the space I have in stating the arguments and explanations of these objectors to my opinion. To me their psychology is equally weak with their philosophy. Some day we shall come to a richer knowledge of Jesus through the aid of psychology. Understanding Him so we shall appreciate Him all the more in His spiritual worth. In this respect the incident we have under consideration will be an outstanding illustration.

It is well known that the words: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' are the opening words of Ps 22. David Smith mentions that 'it was a sentence from that psalm which, says Tertullian, "contains the whole Passion of Christ."' How true that is. Yet how strangely blind theologians, in general, have been to this penetrative expression by Tertullian. These have stayed with the sentence instead of taking in the psalm. Only when we take this psalm as a whole are we ready to see what Jesus meant when He gave utterance to the first sentence of it.

I have sometimes thought that only those enduring martyrdom should write the lives of the martyred; only those being crucified should write the lives of the crucified. The uncrucified are ill prepared to understand, psychologically, the sense and sentiments of the crucified. To enter into that depth one must be more than a looker-on. One needs here sympathy, not pity. Lookers-on are usually so sorry for the victim (*sic*) that they fail to see straight. They report an outward tragedy

and fail to perceive an inward triumph. The whole course of the history of the martyrs is strewn with such misreportings. Can it be that here, in the experience of Jesus, is one?

We suggest that this is by no means improbable. Read the gospel accounts in Matthew and Mark. It is very evident that the words of this utterance were heard with a sense of confusion. The mental and psychological attitude of those who stood around, in so far as it was favourable at all, was one of pity rather than understanding sympathy. Many who stood by thought no more deeply into the facts than that here was a martyrdom that was to prelude a miracle. They failed to divine the significance of what was taking place in Jesus. They were looking *on* Jesus.

'And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, . . . My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' And because He said no more the crowd thought there was no more than that. Curiously enough the Church to this day has largely gone with the crowd. It is time we understood Jesus better than that. Tertullian has the key to what may prove a better explanation. It is the psalm that contains the whole Passion of Christ. But Jesus uttered only one sentence. Here I would become interrogative. Was that the whole intention of Jesus? Let any one read through the twenty-second Psalm and it at once becomes evident that Jesus was thinking in terms of the whole of it. Once this thought is grasped it must not be allowed to go. For what is the purpose of the whole psalm? Just this, that the God who seemed to be behind in the work of salvation was moving according to His own schedule, and they who read the whole psalm and believe it are content to rest in the schedule of God.

Let us visualize the scene, in so far as it is necessary. Jesus, hanging on the Cross, was surrounded chiefly by those who were deriding Him. The twenty-second Psalm tells the story. 'Bulls have compassed me.' 'Dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet.' Well versed in the Scriptures, our Lord remembered especially this one. But not for the words I have quoted only. I like to think it was: 'Ye that fear the Lord, praise him; . . . for he hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted; neither hath he hid his face from him. . . . All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.'

These, I believe, were the things that Jesus was

trying to say; rather, these were the things that Jesus was trying to sing on the Cross. Gethsemane was passed; the victory was obtained there. Now in the hour of outward trial there was the expression of inward victory. But, though the spirit was willing, the flesh was weak. Among the crowd there was exultation. This was the seeming hour of the forces of darkness. But in the Christ there was exaltation; who has not read of the interior exaltation of the martyrs in their hour of deepest trial? When this is conceded and, apart from a piece of mistaken reporting, there is nothing to prevent the acceptance of this, one comes to see that the experience on the Cross was all of a piece. Here is no seeming contradiction to be explained in laborious fashion; here is no faltering of One whom we desire to trust in any circumstance. Here is no queerness on the part of God. It is a strange explanation that wants to make Jesus understand humanity so much that God cannot be God enough to remember Him.

Therefore we present the above explanation for what it is worth. To us it has become worth everything. It is psychologically feasible; philosophically acceptable and religiously uplifting. A friend of mine, who served in the German forces during the war, tells me this story. One day out on the open field of battle a soldier was shot down near

to him, fatally wounded. The blood spurting from an artery told the story. Just then came a lull in the noise of the battle, and there, on the field of battle, the wounded soldier raised himself from the ground, resting on one elbow and began to sing the song of the Fatherland. The dying soldier was singing his faith, not cursing his fate. The effort was too much. Before he came to the end of the song he sank to the ground, dead.

Supposing that that man had been an American, and in that hour he had begun to sing these words: 'O say, can you see by the dawn's early light, What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming?' But because physical strength failed he stopped there, would there be any who would say that that soldier was doubting his country? Would we judge him in terms of dereliction? Would the verdict not rather be that this man was thinking in terms of the whole song, especially that phrase that speaks of the high courage of 'freemen.' Surely, then, it is a strange anomaly that would think of Jesus less divinely in an hour of greater significance.

For the writer the conclusion of the whole matter is that the 'cry' of Jesus was not a cry wrung from a victim in the hour of seeming defeat, but a song that came from an exalted soul in the hour of victory.

The Ebed-Jahwe in Isaiah xl.-lv. in the Light of the Israelite Conceptions of the Community and the Individual, the Ideal and the Real.¹

BY PROFESSOR OTTO EISSFELDT, HALLE.

FOR more than two thousand years the question has been asked as to who is meant by the Ebed-Jahwe in Is 40-55, and especially in the so-called 'Servant Songs' contained therein (42¹⁻⁷ 49¹⁻⁶ 50⁴⁻⁹ 52¹³⁻⁵³¹²). The first answer which we may trace with any certainty is that of the translator of this particular section in the Septuagint; and close upon its heels comes that which, according to Ac 8^{34, 35},

Philip gave to the Ethiopian eunuch in reply to the latter's query as to whether the prophet intended the words in 53^{7, 8} to apply to himself or to another. At the same time, these two answers are typical of the two extremes of possibility in the matter of solving this problem; for the first sees in the Servant a collective entity, the people Israel, while the second sees therein an individual figure, namely, Jesus Christ. Moreover, the second answer also makes it clear why the question as to who is meant by the figure of the Ebed has been raised and discussed most of all in Christendom; one saw therein a

¹ A paper read before the Society for Old Testament Study, January 4, 1933. Professor Eissfeldt is indebted to Dr. A. R. Johnson for the translation into English.

prophecy of Jesus Christ—and more particularly in Is 53 a prophecy of the facts which form the basis of the Christian salvation, the death and resurrection of Jesus.

Century after century, generation after generation have posited the question afresh and sought to answer it, and this is especially true of those who have been called to foster the scientific study of the Old Testament; there is no Old Testament scholar who has not laboured at it, and very many have published their attempts at a solution. Hence the literature upon our subject is enormous. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the answers to our question are so many and varied, they all move between the two poles indicated by the first two which we are able to trace—namely, a collective or an individualistic interpretation. An enumeration of the different answers or even simply a superficial survey of all the work upon our subject is here quite impossible—but also, for our purpose, equally unnecessary. We must rest content with a cursory glance at the work in this field during the last forty years; and, in particular, with the consideration of two publications which, during this period, have been of outstanding importance for the treatment of our question, and have paved the way for that solution which to-day enjoys the greatest favour and seems to many to be the one which alone deserves serious consideration or, indeed, may be regarded as definitely proved.

In 1875 Bernard Duhm, in his *Theologie der Propheten* (p. 289), followed the suggestion already made by Heinrich Ewald with regard to 52¹²-53¹², and raised the possibility 'that the passages xlii. 1-7, xlix. 1-6, l. 4-9, lii. 13-14. 12 are derived from a separate work' because 'the arguments concerning the Servant of Jahwe are not closely interwoven with the rest of the thought,' and 'the work could always be understood if they were lacking.' In 1892, in his Commentary upon *Isaiah*, he definitely adopted the elimination of the poems on the following three grounds: (1) peculiarity of style, language, and metre; (2) loose connexion with the context and the possibility of removing the songs without leaving a gap—'which,' as he nevertheless prudently adds, 'can also certainly be said of many other passages'; and (3) the disparity between what is said concerning the Servant, on the one hand, in the context of the Servant Songs, and, on the other, in the Servant Songs themselves. In the former, 'Israel, just as it is, is the Servant of Jahwe—by Him chosen and guarded and destined for a glorious future, although at present blind and deaf, imprisoned and despoiled, a mere worm despised by

the heathen and full of iniquity. On the other hand, the hero of the Servant Songs is contrasted with the people; he is innocent, the disciple of Jahwe who daily enlightens him, called as a missionary both to his own people and to the heathen, and quietly pursuing his vocation.' Hence, while in 1875 (p. 292) Duhm understood the Servant, not only in the context but also in the Servant Songs, as 'the ideal Israel which possesses the word of God,' by 1892 he could decisively reject the collective interpretation even in the case of the first Song as when he said: 'That most superficial of all interpretations, which would make the Servant of Jahwe a collective entity, may not be maintained even for the first, somewhat ambiguous, Servant Song.' As for the other Servant Songs he goes on to emphasize that the Servant is there treated in an even more individualistic fashion, and that in their case the collective interpretation proves to be absolutely impossible.

Of Duhm's arguments, those which deal with the loose connexion of the Servant Songs and with the complete difference between the collective figure of the Servant in the context and the individual figure in the Songs exerted such a strong influence that the latter came to be regarded more or less generally as a separate entity, in which the Servant was thought of as an individual. In fact, the supporters of this individualistic interpretation eventually outnumbered those who held fast to the collective explanation, also the latter included many brilliant names in their ranks—as Cheyne, Driver, Kennett, Peake, Wheeler Robinson, and others in this country, and Baudissin, Budde, Smend, Wellhausen, and others in Germany. Moreover, some of these—for example, Wellhausen and Smend—accepted the elimination of the Servant Songs while maintaining the collective interpretation.

Of the many and various attempts at an explanation which have been proposed since the first edition of Duhm's Commentary on *Isaiah*, the most outstanding is that published some thirty years later, in 1921, by Sigmund Mowinckel in his monograph, *Der Knecht Jahwe*. Mowinckel's publication exercised an influence comparable with that of Duhm's Commentary, and a whole series of scholars promptly accepted it—for example, Gunkel, Halier, Bala, Sellin, and Volz. The last two, however, made certain modifications. Thus Sellin regards the passage 52¹²-53¹² as having been composed by Triton-Isaiah, the pupil and disciple of Deutero-Isaiah, by way of 'a lament on the part of the pupil for his master, the elucidation of the riddle of his life, and the proclamation of his future existence, his glor-

fication and the continuation of his vocation.' Volz, on the other hand, regards this passage as an eschatological poem of the fourth or third century before Christ.

The influence of Mowinckel's work, however, extends in yet another direction. He had renewed the observation already made by earlier scholars, that in Is 40-55 there are two figures of whom the realization of the eschatological hope was expected, namely, Cyrus and the Ebed; and that, while Cyrus first occupies the foreground, he is afterwards forced more and more into the background by the latter. Haller developed this further into the theory that the prophet found himself more and more disillusioned in the hopes which he had originally placed in the king, and that 'the other, the prophetic, instrument which he himself represents in his own person, namely, the spiritual power in contrast to that of the secular world, now becomes for him all the more important.' This observation was then set by Johannes Hempel in a wider connexion. According to him, the Servant Songs stand in marked contrast to the Cyrus poems; and one Cyrus poem, namely, 45¹⁻⁶, has been definitely refashioned into a Servant Song, to wit, 42⁵⁻⁹—an eloquent testimony to the fact that the Prophet's expectation of a redeemer had undergone a complete transformation. In short, the Servant of the Lord takes the place of the Persian king. The question as to who is meant by this figure, of course, remains a riddle. At first Hempel appears inclined to follow Rudolf Kittel, Rudolph, and Oesterley, and to see therein 'a definite figure in the circle of the prophet, to whom the latter's longings and hopes turned after his disillusionment with regard to Cyrus.' Recently Mowinckel, in modification of his former view, has suggested that the Servant Songs were influenced by the Cyrus poems of Deutero-Isaiah, and bear witness to the fact that in the meantime the prophet's views with regard to the bringer of salvation had undergone a complete change; only, according to Mowinckel, this complete change took place not in Deutero-Isaiah but in the circle of his disciples, and it was amongst the latter that the Servant Songs arose. Moreover, Mowinckel now leaves open the question as to who is to be understood by the figure of the Servant. Finally, Volz has expressed the opinion that the Servant Songs (with the exception of the last, which he regards as of much later origin) form a piece of autobiography on the part of Deutero-Isaiah, and indicate the decisive turning-point in his life; for he abandons the hope formerly centred in Cyrus, and so in a secular and political power, in order to be overwhelmed instead with the

knowledge that he, the prophet, is to bring about the dawn of God's kingdom on earth. 'He had been filled with enthusiasm for Cyrus, but in himself there lived an equal, nay a greater, passion for conquest. Thus the divine knowledge suddenly came to him that the establishment of God's kingdom on earth was not an eschatological event but, rather, was to be brought about by human hands, and that he, Deutero-Isaiah, was the one appointed for the work. Not Cyrus but he himself was to be the conqueror of the world; not Israel but he himself was to become God's witness.' Hence, although no complete agreement could be found as to who is meant by the Ebed of the Servant Songs, and although Mowinckel himself has shattered such agreement as had been more or less widely reached, and although it still remains uncertain as to when and by whom the poems in question were composed, yet as a matter of fact scholars have arrived at a considerable measure of agreement in regarding the Servant Songs as a correction of the Cyrus poems; and there is justification for Hempel when he asserts with some satisfaction that 'a fixed point here seems to have been reached in the matter of interpretation—namely, the conception of the Servant Songs as a correction of the Cyrus poems.' Now, to be sure, the principle of Vincentius of Lerinum that *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est* is also true, does not hold good in the realm of scientific study; and such an opinion is far from the thoughts of the editor of the Z.A.T.W. Nevertheless, it is certainly true that the work done by Duhm, Mowinckel, and their followers on Is 40-55 and the Servant Songs represents a real scholarly performance, which has furthered the understanding of their subject and, above and beyond, that of the history of Israelite literature and religion in general. Of course, the recognition of this fact does not mean that the constantly necessary examination of conclusions and especially of hypotheses is superfluous in this case. The grounds for the aforementioned attempts at an explanation (which have come to be thought of more and more as not requiring further examination) are, as we have seen: (1) the loose connexion of the Servant Songs, and (2) the complete difference between the figure of the Ebed as pictured therein and as otherwise depicted in Is 40-55.

Now we must first emphasize the fact that the first argument has to-day lost all its significance. It is now more and more generally recognized that Is 40-55 is not a book composed in artistic fashion according to some particular literary scheme, but, rather, that we have here a loose collection of

separate poems and sayings similar to those found elsewhere in the prophetic books. The principle upon which they are arranged is not yet clear; and Mowinckel, who thought that he had found it with his catchword theory, can scarcely be right. It seems rather more likely that, at least here and there, a grouping according to subject is to be recognized. This much, however, holds good for every case: the fact that the Servant Songs are loosely connected is or would be no warrant for the assumption that they must be removed and regarded as a separate entity, on the ground that they were not composed by the author of their context. As a matter of fact, from the very first this argument ought not to have been used, for in 1892 Duhm himself admitted, as we have seen, that other passages than those of the Servant Songs could be eliminated without leaving a gap; and there are no other formal grounds which justify the removal of the poems from their context. Moreover, style and phraseology form an argument *for* rather than *against* the view that Deutero-Isaiah was the author of the Servant Songs. The fact that the style and phraseology of these poems are the same as, or similar to, that of Deutero-Isaiah has been almost generally recognized—even by those who assume another author for the Servant Songs. In such a case it is held that the latter were composed by a pupil of Deutero-Isaiah, or that Deutero-Isaiah himself had come across the poems and had used their language as a model. Hence, of the two chief arguments which are constantly adduced for the individualistic interpretation of the Ebed of the Servant Songs, there now remains the one which regards the Ebed in these poems as a completely different figure from that of the Ebed in their context. This argument in turn is based upon two observations: (1) The 'personification' of the people Israel, which is recognized as intrinsically possible and, indeed, as definitely present in the context, is supposed to be so exaggerated in the Servant Songs as to transcend the bounds of possibility; here the Ebed must be understood as a real individual. (2) In one of the Servant Songs, 49^{5, 6}, the Ebed is assigned a commission to Israel; hence he cannot be Israel, because he is contrasted with the latter. Moreover, the view that possibly the ideal Israel is intended cannot be considered seriously, for in Hebrew such a conception is quite impossible.

Everything depends upon the validity of these two contentions. So far as the former is concerned, one must first recall the fact, which is too often insufficiently appreciated, that in Is 40-55, outside

the Servant Songs, the Ebed-Jahwe undoubtedly signifies Israel; that, in consequence, the conception of the community as an individual is quite clearly present (41^{8, 9} 42¹⁹ 43¹⁰ 44^{1, 2, 21, 26} 45⁴ 48²⁰). What is more, the matter is not just limited to the mere use of the name Ebed for Israel; characteristics which are suitable only to an individual are frequently applied to him. Thus he is addressed by 'Thou' (41⁸⁻¹⁵ and oft), and has a right hand (41¹³); he has eyes but does not see, ears but hears not (42¹⁹); he was fashioned by Jahwe in his mother's womb (44^{1, 2}), and so on. In this connexion the difference between the Ebed of the context and that of the Servant Songs is only one of quantity and not one of quality, inasmuch as in the latter still more individualistic traits are predicated of the Servant. At bottom this distinction is the same as that, for example, between Hos 9¹, where it is said of Israel in terms of a woman that she has gone a-whoring from Jahwe, and Hos 2⁴⁻²³, where this conception is more fully developed. As matters now stand, the assumption that the Servant Songs were the work of Deutero-Isaiah, and that the figure of the Ebed therein is to be understood as elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah, has the right of precedence on its side; and the contrary assertion, if it were to have any prospect of success, would have to be based upon really strong foundations. The arguments usually brought forward are not sufficient for this.

The assumption, however, which is primarily suggested by a simple examination of the facts in Is 40-55 may be fixed on a still firmer basis by setting the figure of the Ebed in a wider connexion and viewing it in the light of the Hebrew conceptions of the community and the individual, the ideal and the real. The description of Israel as an Ebed in Is 40-55 is usually called a 'personification,' and it is tacitly assumed thereby that here and elsewhere we have an artificial composition by means of which the mass of individuals is conceived as an abstract unity. To describe what we have here, however, as a 'personification' does not do justice to the facts. To Israelite thought, which in this connexion is quite in harmony with Semitic thought in general and also has its parallels outside the Semitic world, unity is prior to diversity, the community prior to the individual; the real entity is the community, and the individuals belonging to it have their origin therein. This is especially true of the actual or fictitious blood-communities—family, clan, tribe, or people—each not an aggregate of individuals but a unity which owes its being to, and is continually bound up in, a particular ancestor. Thus to the Israelite his people are a unity, an

individual. As a rule, the real or fictitious ancestor or ancestress appears as such: for the latter do not belong simply to the past; they live on in the community which owes its being to them and participate in, even determine, its destiny. The unity of such a social group, however, can also be conceived as an individual in yet another way; or, to be more correct, the tribal ancestor or ancestress can be characterized as to some special aspect, and then, in accordance with that distinctive feature or particular task of the community which is to be expressed, represented as an individual who bears in his or her own person in an especially visible way this one characteristic. Thus the author of La 3 conceives Jerusalem as a man plagued unceasingly and unmercifully by Jahwe, and exaggerates this conception to such an extent that many scholars believe the poem must relate to an individual. Vv.⁴⁰⁻⁴², however, where the author is obliged to begin three lines with the letter 'Nun' and is therefore compelled to change over to the first person plural, show quite clearly that in this particular composition, which by its acrostic form is obviously a unity, not an individual but a collective entity is meant—namely, Jerusalem. Similarly, when Ezekiel wishes to illustrate the idolatry of Jerusalem and Samaria, he pictures the two cities as women who have gone a-whoring with all the world; and this picture is painted in far greater detail than is the case in the Songs of the Servant. In the same way Deutero-Isaiah, who is quite overwhelmed with the thought of the spiritual vocation which Israel has towards the world and would like to impart his own faith therein to his contemporaries, treats Israel as an individual, bestows upon him the title of honour 'Ebed-Jahwe' which was originally the prerogative of the prophet, and supplies the figure of the prophet who now appears before his eyes with just those characteristics and experiences which are typical of the prophets known to him both out of the past and in the present. In so doing he also undoubtedly modelled the figure after himself; and to that extent it is right to identify the Ebed with Deutero-Isaiah. In particular, as it has long been recognized, he may have been influenced to some extent by the case of Jeremiah. Thus the latter may be found to illustrate all such characteristics of the Ebed outside the Servant Songs, as that he is chosen by Jahwe (41⁸), fashioned by Him in his mother's womb (44²), entrusted with a commission to Israel and the nations (42²¹ 43¹⁰⁻¹³ 44³⁻⁵)—save that in the case of the Ebed it is more strongly emphasized than previously that he has to bring Jahwe's light and salvation to the whole world; that is the new

element in Deutero-Isaiah's message. Similarly it holds good of the Ebed in the Servant Songs, and in this case to a yet higher degree, that the figure of Jeremiah may have served as a model. Like the Ebed of 42¹⁻⁷ Jeremiah is also quiet and considerate, meek and retiring in appearance (11¹⁹ 15^{10, 11} 18²⁰). Like the Ebed of 49¹⁻⁶ Jeremiah despaired more than once as to the success of his preaching, and was thereupon always equipped afresh by his God with new power and a further promise (15^{18, 19} 17¹⁴⁻¹⁷). Jeremiah also resembles the Ebed (50⁴⁻⁹) in that, like the latter, he had to suffer much enmity and persecution on the part of men, and found his courage again only in his trust in God (11¹⁸⁻²³ 18¹⁸⁻²³). Finally, the last Servant Song, which by its unique content (the discovery of the significance of vicarious death) stands on a pinnacle by itself, has at least points of contact in the lives of Jeremiah and other prophets. Thus men also sought to prepare a shameful end for Jeremiah (11¹⁸⁻²³ 18¹⁸); and one of his fellow-prophets, Uriah, was actually put to death and his body thrown upon the burial-ground of the common people (26²⁰⁻²³). Jeremiah also seems to have been conscious that he must suffer want and pain not only innocently but also vicariously (15^{10, 15b, 18} 16^{1, 2} 18²⁰); and although prior to Is 53 no case is expressly attested in which a community had later recognized that a man of God had suffered and died on its behalf, yet it may certainly be assumed, without the least detriment to the incomparable worth of this passage, that occasionally before this sepulchres had been specially built and garnished for prophets who had been slain (Mt 23^{29, 30}), and that thereby expression had been given, if not to the actual recognition, at least to a feeling that their death was of significance with regard to salvation.

The comparison of the figure of the Ebed in the Servant Songs with the lives of those prophets who are known to us, and especially with that of Jeremiah, is very important for our purpose in yet another connexion. Thus another argument often adduced against the identification of the Ebed in the context with that in the Servant Songs is to the effect that, in the former, imperfection and sin are ascribed to the Ebed, and to the people Israel to be understood thereby, while the Ebed of the Servant Songs, especially the last, suffers vicariously for the sins of others and so is thought of as sinless. It is to be observed, however, that even outside the Servant Songs, thus right at the beginning of Is 40-55, in 40², it is asserted that Jerusalem's guilt is expiated, indeed that Jerusalem has received from the hand of Jahwe double punishment for all her

sins ; and so the possibility is at least suggested that the surplus punishment may be credited to others. What is more, the fact that, in contrast to God, a man is sinful and can therefore be reprimanded by Him and that, in the presence of God, he is himself painfully and humbly conscious of this does not exclude the possibility that, in contrast to other men and peoples, he may appear righteous and, with an eye to them, can feel and describe some grievous misfortune as undeserved. Still less does it exclude the possibility that the others should thus appraise the suffering of one who is far and away their superior, and that they should find the only possible explanation to be that of a vicarious suffering for what is really their own guilt. Thus Jeremiah, for example, is humbly conscious of his imperfection and sinfulness in the presence of Jahwe ; yet in the strength of this God of his he stands erect over against his fellows as a defended city and as a brazen wall (1¹⁸) ; and the certainty that he has to endure hardship and suffering for the sake of his prophetic vocation, and not simply because of his sins, remains quite unshaken by the knowledge of his own particular guilt.

In short, it is impossible to maintain the objection against connecting the Ebed of the Servant Songs with the people Israel on the ground that the individualization or personification is exaggerated far beyond the bounds conceivable and admissible for such cases. As a matter of fact, such a conception of the community as a sharply characterized individual entity is entirely in keeping with the Hebrew mode of thought ; and a whole series of similar and quite incontestable passages may be adduced in evidence of this. Nevertheless, we have not yet done with the other objection—to the effect that in Is 49⁵⁻⁶ the Ebed has a commission to Israel and so is bound to be distinguished from him. Moreover, it seems to me that the objection in question is not invalidated by the view of Ferdinand Hitzig and Budde, who have suggested that the Lamed-phrases in 49⁵⁻⁶ are to be explained, not as infinitives, but as gerunds, and so to be connected with Jahwe as the subject and rendered thus : ' while he brought Jacob back to him, and gathered Israel to himself (in Israel's being led out of Egypt to Jahwe's dwelling Sinai, and gathered to His people by their great leader Moses), ' and ' in so far as I (Jahwe) raise up the tribes of Jacob, and restore the preserved of Israel. ' To be sure, this interpretation of the two Lamed-phrases must be regarded as grammatically possible ; but in the present connexion it is really quite improbable in view of the preceding statement : ' It is too small a thing for

the Ebed-service which thou dost render me. ' This requires that mention should first be made of some smaller task, and one not in keeping with his position, which the Ebed is to perform, and the more appropriate and greater service is promised him. Hence it cannot be disputed that we have here a reference to a commission which the Ebed has to Israel-Jacob, and this would seem to imply that the Ebed of this particular Servant Song, and so of the Servant Songs in general, is bound to be regarded as an individual ; for to think of an ideal Israel or the like is to-day tabu so far as most scholars are concerned. Thus in 1921 Mowinckel, for example, pronounced the verdict that ' a distinction between the ideal and the real is not in keeping with the thought of Israel and the Old Testament ' ; and in 1929 Gunkel, in his last pronouncement on this question, expressed himself in still more decisive terms when he said : ' Other explanations, such as that which would make the subject in question an "ideal" Israel, a term wholly foreign to the Hebrew language, ought never to have been suggested. ' Before I myself go on to deal with this point, let me contrast with these two pronouncements the verdict of an Old Testament and Semitic scholar who has given much time and thought to this particular subject and has penetrated deeply into its psychological background. Thus Johannes Pedersen, in his book which was published in English in 1926 under the title of *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, makes the following statement (p. 475) : ' A people is not a collection of human beings. . . . It is a psychical whole, and in so far an ideal quantity. . . . It is lived wholly in every generation, and yet it is raised above it, is something which is given to it and makes claims upon it. ' Such a passage shows that the above condemnations, for all that they are pronounced by scholars whose opinions are important and deserving of the highest consideration, do not represent the final word on this point.

In fact, although his language knows so little of the conception of the 'ideal' of a people or some other social group, the thing itself was familiar enough to the Hebrew. We have already seen that for him the community as a whole is prior to the individual members—not something secondary which is reached by adding the latter together. We saw further that this social group is thought of as owing its being to a 'father,' or even a 'mother,' who by no means simply belongs to the past but lives on with the social group and is present in it. Thus it is always possible to distinguish between the figure of the ancestor or ancestress, representative

of the whole, and the individual members—between Israel and the Israelites, between Zion and her children, and so on; and the former is pictured time and again as speaking of the latter or dealing with them. Thus Rachel weeps for her children, and refuses to be comforted (Jer 31^{15, 18}); the daughter Zion laments the death of her young manhood (La 1^{12, 18}), and is summoned by the poet to pray for the life of her little ones (2¹⁹), and so on; and even in the Psalms of Solomon the 'I' of the Jewish people or of the Jewish cultus community still speaks of her children (Ps Sol 1 and oft). The distinction between the corporate individual and the particular members of the social group is thus quite a customary thing, and the contrast may also be of such a kind that the corporate individual is thought of as a model and a tutor. The simple conception of the social group as a 'father' or 'mother' really implies that it is thought of as embodying all that was of proved value in the past, and forming the repository of virtue and justice; and that therefore at any given time it is opposed to the present as the 'ideal.' For throughout the world in general, and particularly in Israel, the father and mother are something more than the mere procreators, even something more than just the protectors and supporters, of the children; it falls to them most of all to transmit to the latter the virtue and wisdom of their forefathers. A couple of examples may serve to make this clear. Thus in 2 S 20^{18, 19} the city Abel, like the city Dan, is called a 'mother' in Israel, from whom one learns what the faithful in Israel have ordained. Similarly, the expression עָשָׂה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל does not mean 'commit a crime in Israel,' but 'commit a crime against Israel'—that is to say, against the repository of the ancient customs and morality which the ancestor, who is present in every generation, embodies in himself. In Dt 22²¹, Jos 7¹⁵, Jg 20^{6, 10}, and Jer 29²³ the rendering 'in Israel' would certainly be possible, but in Gn 34⁷ it is quite unsuitable. Here the use of the expression is usually explained as an anachronism on the ground that the narrator has applied to the patriarchal period, when as yet there was really no nation Israel, a later form of speech which presupposes its existence. As a matter of fact, the patriarch, besides embodying the qualities and attributes of the later people and letting them shine through his own person and life as through a glass, also conceals the treasure of the ancient morality. Finally, one may consider the fact that amongst the Israelites, as amongst the Semites in general, the name 'father' and, less often, that of 'mother' are used in the special sense of the tribal

deity—and so of an entity corresponding to the tribe and the tribal ancestor, but belonging to a higher sphere. In such a use of the names in question there is already implicit the difference between the figure so named and those who employ the name, between 'father' and 'children'—a difference just in so far as the former stands over against the latter as an 'ideal' which makes certain demands of them. The fact that both the tribal deity and the tribal ancestor could be thought of as a 'father' without any general confusion of the two spheres shows, on the one hand, that the Israelite conception of God cannot be derived from ancestor-worship but must be understood as something entirely *sui generis*, and, on the other, that also the ancestor, the corporate individual constantly present, is not only in the community but also stands over it, or, as we should say, represents the 'ideal' of the social group. Hence, when any such corporate name as 'Israel' or 'Jacob' is used, or when the people are conceived in any other way as a unit, it is frequently, and indeed usually, the case that the ideal entity is implied. Sometimes it happens that the tribal 'father' or 'mother' offers a caricature of the social group and is thought of as embodying its disgraceful qualities (Hos 12, Ezk 16, 23), so that even the 'children' can be summoned as their mother's judges (Hos 2⁴). This, however, is not the usual practice; as a rule the corporate name stands over against the individuals as a model—and this is equally true of such cases as those, still current in Jewish forms of prayer, in which the divine mercy is sought at any given time for the Abraham or Jacob present in the particular social group (Mic 7²⁰), or, for their sake, for the community (Dt 9²⁷).

Hence Israelite thought is quite familiar with the conception of an ideal entity which, while present in the particular social group at any given time, is nevertheless over and above it, and, while identical, is yet different. It is possible for this to be expressed by the simple term 'Israel' or 'Jacob'; but, when the prophetic title of honour 'Ebed' is linked with either of these names, it is perfectly clear that it is the ideal and not the real entity which is meant, and it is self-evident that this ideal entity can have a communion to the real one. Hence one may readily understand that the Ebed is to bring Jacob back to Jahwe, and gather Israel unto Him (49⁵), that he is to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and restore the preserved of Israel (49⁶); and it can scarcely be a mere accident that in v.⁶ the object of his activity is not the corporate figure in the singular but the individual tribes or persons in the plural. As a matter of fact, just as in the

examples from Lamentations, it is by these means that the ideal corporate individual is distinguished from the real individuals.

Hence, as against the prevalent view which sees an individual in the Ebed of the Servant Songs, the collective interpretation may well be the one which really meets the facts of the case, being more in harmony with the present context of the Songs and corresponding most readily with the Hebrew views of the community and the individual, the ideal and the real. In the Servant Songs, and especially in the last (52¹³-53¹²), Deutero-Isaiah gives clear expression to what he proclaims, or at least suggests, in his other poems—to wit, that Israel had to suffer his grievous fate, the fall of the State and the deportation of his inhabitants, for the sake of a great aim; in short, that his God might be recognized and worshipped throughout the world, by all Israelites and even more by all the peoples in general, as the one, true God, and that, to this end, Israel had suffered vicariously for the other peoples. At the same time, it is pleasing to reflect that, although the

interpretation here recommended stands opposed to that which at present enjoys the greater popularity, both views are nevertheless one in their emphasis upon the peculiar worth of the Servant Songs—and, again, particularly the last. Both views bow before the perception, which, after being won at the cost of suffering and death, here finds clear expression, that distress and death do not represent God's condemnation of the persons concerned and so mark them down as singled out by God, but rather that a man visited with such a fate, or a people thus put to the test, can stand nearer to God than more fortunate men and peoples, indeed that such men and peoples may have to suffer for the others; and both views are one in agreeing that such a perception marks a turning-point in the history of mankind. Moreover, both views stand devoutly silent before the fact that six centuries later a Man walked the earth whose life and suffering, death and resurrection, not only found their wondrous explanation in the Servant Songs, but also first taught us to understand the real content of the latter.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Adventurers of the Sky.

BY THE REVEREND R. OSWALD DAVIES, LEICESTER.

'I will scale the cloud-banks.'—Is 14¹⁴ (Moffatt).

SOME time ago we witnessed two distinct achievements in the realm of the sky.

1. The first was the crossing of the Atlantic by Mr. J. A. Mollison, the intrepid airman. He left Portmarnock Strand in Ireland and landed in Pennfield Ridge, near New Brunswick, having flown a distance of two thousand six hundred miles in thirty and a quarter hours. Crossing the Atlantic in this way is by now familiar to us; and Mollison was not the first to make a solo flight between the two continents. What gave to his achievement distinction was the fact that he flew from East to West—a far more difficult task—and that he did so in a far less powerful machine than any previously employed. In Mollison's flight across the Atlantic there are a few things it would be well for us to observe.

(a) *One of the prime necessities of his successful*

flight was absolute concentration on his course.—He would have no mountains or rivers—no landmarks of any kind to direct his course. He would have to pay most careful attention to his course. One thing is certain. Had he made an error at the beginning of his journey, it might easily have proved a fatal one. Instead of reaching his destination in safety, he would find himself hundreds of miles out of his course. Indeed, he might not have made his landfall at all!

How tremendously important it is, then, to make the right beginning in life. The morning of life is a time of beginnings; and what beginnings are then made will have their consequences, for good or bad, in after-life. Was not this the secret of Jesus Himself? He made a great and good beginning. At the age of twelve we find Him in His Father's house and on His Father's business. Is there any wonder that Jesus became the Man He was?

(b) *Mollison in his flight had to do much blind-flying.*—Night came on and the intrepid airman had to fly in the dark. There was now no horizon and he had to rely on his instruments. That is

called blind-flying. But when Mollison reached the other side and landed at Pennfield Ridge, he found that his instruments had not failed him.

Later in life you will have to do much blind-flying. There are times in life when the darkness comes down—when the horizon is blotted out. It is then you will have to rely upon something within. In the hour of difficulty there is an inner voice which tells us what to do and directs our course. Some call it Conscience; others call it God. If we listen to that inner voice it will never fail us.

(c) *There was another peril which Mollison encountered; it was drowsiness.*—Think of the strain and weariness of flying alone for thirty hours! How tired he must have been long before land was in sight. And because of that, one of his chief perils was drowsiness—the peril of dropping to sleep! Had he done that for but one moment, he would have dropped into the sea, and his adventure would have come to a tragic end.

It is a fine thing to start well in life—to make a good beginning. It is a finer thing not to fail on the way, but to 'stick it' till you reach your goal. You need grit and courage and perseverance to do that. 'You did run well,' said Paul to the Galatians; 'who did hinder you?' You started off splendidly; what a pity you did not keep it up! Make up your minds to be not only good starters, but also good stayers. Beware of the peril of drowsiness.

2. The second achievement was by Professor A. Piccard, the distinguished Belgian scientist.

At the same time as Mollison was crossing the Atlantic, Professor Piccard was attaining a height as yet unattained by man. In his balloon he ascended to a height of ten and a half miles in the sky. Why did he do this?

(a) *He entered the kingdom of the stratosphere.*—There he was able to make a closer study of the cosmic rays which are still a mystery to the scientific world. They are the most potent of all the rays, and affect profoundly our life upon the earth. He tells us that when he entered the stratosphere these cosmic rays simply poured on his cabin, and that his instruments were alive in their sensitiveness to them.

Here is a man who sought the kingdom of the stratosphere and who climbed to unknown heights that he might gain contact with the cosmic rays.

And to live well, we too must enter the stratosphere of God and allow the rays of Purity, Good-

ness, and Beauty to penetrate our hearts. These are the potent rays of God which affect our life profoundly on the earth.

(b) But perhaps most interesting of all, Professor Piccard tells us that this same stratosphere, will, no doubt, be the airway of the future.

There are no storms there, no ice, no snow. The temperature is always between fifty and sixty degrees below zero centigrade. The winds always blow horizontally, so that there would be no delays to the traveller.

He speaks confidently of the strato-tourists of the future who will be able to travel from Paris to New York in six hours.

The Mollison of the future will follow the strato-ways of heaven, and will traverse a distance of two thousand six hundred miles in six hours instead of thirty.

There is, then, a definite relationship between Piccard and Mollison. The high-flier has rendered a distinct service to the long-distance flier. The truth is that if you want to fly far you must first fly high. It is the high-flier who will also be the long-distance flier.

This is very true of life. The men who have gone far in the life of the world are the men who sought the stratosphere of God. Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Florence Nightingale, David Livingstone, and a host of others—these went far, very far, in the life of the world because they sought the heights of Goodness, Purity, and Truth.

Above all, Jesus is our perfect example in this. He went farthest of them all because He went highest. He was indeed in touch with Heaven—at home in the stratosphere of God. And after nineteen hundred years men still feel the power of His presence.

Say then with the prophet: 'I will scale the cloud-banks.'

Catching the 'Flu.'

BY THE REVEREND D. T. DAVIES, M.A., B.D.,
LONDON.

'Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.'—Mk i¹⁷.

Yes, it has come back again, this wretched 'Flu.' A heavy head, watery eyes, and a hot and bothered feeling. There is nothing for it but to stay at home from school and go to bed. Then comes the doctor with his nasty physic and the usual orders—'A tablespoonful to be taken every four hours.' The next day we hear that Tom and Harry have got it, so that the thing goes round the

home, school, and town. The 'Flu' is 'catching'; one gets it from another like passing the word along the line at drill.

Now, let us look at this word 'Influenza' which we call 'Flu' for short. Why, you keen girls and boys must have seen that it is just our English word 'Influence.' Only that, for some strange reason, it has been to Italy to have its tail cut off. The word has come back to us with the letters *za* instead of *ce* tagged on at the end. 'Influenza' is but Italian for 'Influence,' which means the inflowing of a power from one person to another. We shall, for the moment, drop the foreign form of the word and keep our own native term to denote the *right* kind of influenza, something that does not make the head ache, but makes the heart glad and life rich and radiant.

You will remember the story of little Arthur in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. On his first night at school, when Arthur knelt down to say his prayers by his bed in the dormitory, he was pelted with slippers by the other boys, who jeered at him. The following night, while still suffering from the effects of this 'ragging,' his first impulse was to creep into bed and say his prayers under the clothes. On second thoughts, however, he felt that this would be to play the coward. Besides, why should he be ashamed to wear the colours of his Captain the Lord Jesus Christ.

Arthur knelt down by his bed as on the previous night. Fewer slippers were thrown at him this time. The boys began to see that although a frail little laddie yet he was 'game.' By the end of the week every boy in that dormitory knelt down to say his prayers before going to bed.

They had caught the 'influence' from little Arthur.

This takes us right back to that scene by the Lake of Galilee where Jesus met two of His first disciples. They happened to be fishermen. Jesus, knowing this, said to them, 'Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.' There was to *in-flow* from Him to them a spirit, or power, of goodness, which would be felt by others. They were to 'catch' men for Christ and His Kingdom. Thus it turned out to be. Andrew went after Jesus and was the means of bringing Peter, his brother. Philip, likewise, brought the 'influence' to bear upon Nathanael, and so the golden chain that links men to Jesus Christ goes on even to this very day.

It is a great honour to so live in close friendship with Jesus Christ that we may make disciples of others to learn of and serve Him. No one is too

small or too young for such a venture, for do we not read in the Bible, 'A little child shall lead them'?

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Kingdom of Light.

'But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.'—Ph 3'.

There are times in the lives of each of us when the Kingdom of Darkness stands over against the Kingdom of Light. It is no question of half shades, but a clear choice of black or white.

From much of the talk that we hear we might think that no man ever chose the evil when he clearly knew it to be evil, that all sinners have been misled, that they did not know what they were doing. That is not so. Evil has its own baleful fascination for us at times even when we know it is evil. Nine times out of the ten, when we are faced with the solicitation of that which we clearly see to be evil, we have no hesitation in refusing to choose it—but the tenth time we choose the evil. We have to admit these facts. They are ugly, and we would like to give them a finer name and delude ourselves, but truth compels us to acknowledge that in choosing the evil we were not deluded at all, in taking the black we were not blind for a moment.

It is not always a choice between good and evil that faces us, but between that which is good in itself and something which is far better—there is no attempt to convince us that our gains are not good, for they are.

Dr. Jane Harrison, who died in 1928 at the age of seventy-seven, was a brilliant lecturer and writer on Greek literature and art. On being asked why she had ceased to lecture on Greek art, she said, 'I simply can't; religion is so much more interesting.'

What were the gains that Paul counted as loss for the greater gain of being found in Christ? They were those things that formed the boast of his friends, and were the claims of his enemies, the things for which men seek and for which they yearn—birth, lineage, rank, education, social standing, moral attainments—the very things that men count precious. The reference is to those who would not become Christians, because they relied on their Jewish birth, on their fulfilment of

the Law, their circumcision, their zeal, and their righteousness.

The prevalence and dangers of this attitude require that we should be on our guard, lest we be robbed of our greater inheritance, lest the proverbial bird in the hand, which is often a bird of fine plumage and sweet song, should cheat us of the still sweeter song of the bird in the leaves over our head.

Undoubtedly our first school-books were of inestimable value, and we could prove that nothing else could have fulfilled their work as well. Nevertheless, they have to be left behind if the mind is to grow. Could not Abraham have demonstrated that he stood to lose all that was most precious and undoubtedly good if he went out from his home in Ur of the Chaldees; and would not his friends point the moral of all this? Yet his salvation, and the development of truth and Divine revelation which followed, demanded that he should be a pilgrim on the face of the earth, and go out from his home not knowing whither his feet were taking him. But he came to the Promised Land.

The same principle lies at the heart of that coming of the rich young ruler to Christ. It was not fanatical hatred of wealth that made Christ demand that he should sell all if he would be truly emancipated. The secondary thing was in the way of the primary, the lower good in the way of the higher.

If the gains that are ours to-day are to rob us of the richer treasure of the morrows, we must not only regard them as rubbish but as loss. How can we think that the best came first? How could the highest truth, the best good, the fullest revelation, come to us in the infancy of the race? It must, by the very nature that is ours, be true that 'the best is yet to be.' Every generation can see the truth of this when it is applied to past times. But our eyes are holden and our passions roused when some bold spirit would physic our sick souls with the same astringent medicine. Whoever challenges the good in the name of the better is dubbed an enemy of the people.

Our sins shame us and challenge us to fight, but our little virtues make us afraid lest we be satisfied. We are not afraid of the Devil. We do fear the close demands of God. We turn and fight the Devil. We turn and flee from God. We hug that which is ours, thinking that we are on the side of truth against error, forgetting

How little I have gained,
How vast the unattained.

We join the crowd who stone the Stephens. We make our Galileos recant the new truth. Rather we should be amongst those who

Feel the earth move sunward,
Join the great march onward.

Hail to the coming singers!
Hail to the brave light-bringers!
Forward I reach and share
All that they sing and dare.

There is the religious application also of the principle we have been considering. Paul left the revelation of God in the Law which dealt with the deed, to follow the morality of Christ which dealt with the motive which brings forth the fruits of the Spirit. He left the commands of Moses to follow the commands of Christ, confident that all the good of Moses was to be found in Christ, and all that transfiguring 'more' which could never come to him through Moses. Paul left the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees and sought the righteousness of Christ.

The same call comes to us and to all men everywhere, and in every age. Neither individual nor nation can come into the full inheritance save at the cost of regarding as loss the previous gains, and going out with staff and wallet to follow the call of the higher.

The last stage of all has come when our contentment with the present attainment deafens our ears to the call of the highest. To what abysmal poverty we condemn ourselves if we do this; for we not only rob ourselves of the truest riches, but we cannot get the full worth of that which we already prize. If we revel in our primers, we not only can never revel in the glories of the greater literature, but we do not use well nor get the best out of our primers.

If we pride ourselves on our morality, on our respectability, our good manners, our culture, which are all good in themselves, all desirable possessions, we not only rob ourselves of the unsearchable riches of Christ, and of the Christ life, and the thrill of a rich soul life, but the very good of that we thus hoard turns to dross and poisons our life.

No man so well uses this world and gets the real good of this life as he who looks for a city that hath foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God.

'What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.'¹

¹ A. Hird, *The Test of Discipleship*, 74.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Seeing the Father.

'Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?'—Jn 14.

In these words we can discern not only the thoughts, but also the feelings of Jesus, and we shall often understand His thoughts better if we feel with Him. He is *disappointed*. 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?' Nevertheless He is still *confident*. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' And so He is *surprised*. 'How sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?' Disappointment, confidence, surprise—all these emotions are blended in this claim that a Divine revelation, sufficient and satisfying, has been given in Him.

1. *Jesus' Disappointment*.—'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?' This emotion was once and again expressed by Jesus. As a boy in the Temple, He was disappointed that the motive of His remaining behind in Jerusalem was not understood. As a teacher He was often disappointed by the failure of His disciples to grasp His meaning. As a worker He was disappointed by the lack of faith of those who came to Him for healing. So here, at the very close of His earthly ministry, in His last talk with His companions before He suffered, He was disappointed by Philip's foolish and vain request for a more adequate and convincing revelation of God than He had as yet given.

Two reasons for Jesus' disappointment may be suggested.

(1) Jesus had brought His disciples into immediate contact and intimate communion with Himself. He had made them His intimates and His confidants. He had not concealed His inner life from them, but had made His spirit absolutely transparent to them. Doubtless there was a Holy of holies of His fellowship with God into which even they were not allowed to enter; but the glory of the God-presence there shone through all reserve and restraint into the holy place of His intimacy and confidence with them, and even streamed into the outer court of His teaching and training. The false man may make his life so skilfully a play-acting that from what appears upon the stage men may not even suspect what is going on behind the scenes. Even the good man has imaginations and impulses which his respect for himself and his regard for others compel him to conceal and repress.

Jesus had nothing to conceal, and by His very vocation almost everything to reveal. If God dwells within the soul as He is never fully seen in the life, and if Jesus was the revelation of God, His inner life was no private possession but a universal benefaction, which He did not and could not withhold from those whom it was meant to bless. When we lay aside our natural reserve and give another our full confidence, is there any disappointment keener than that we feel when we discover that we have laid bare our heart in vain? May we not suppose that Jesus felt that disappointment as keenly?

(2) The life which He had thus put within the reach of the knowledge and the understanding of His disciples was one of which a total impression could be formed, for it was so constantly consistent. The fickle and wilful man cannot be known and understood, for the impression he gives one day may be taken away the next. The truer and better a man is, with one inspiring motive, one compelling purpose, one definite direction in his life, the more easy is knowledge and understanding. It was Jesus' meat and drink to do His Father's will. All His thoughts were moulded by one spirit of truth; all His feelings moved by one impulse of love; all His deeds were directed to one purpose of the glory of God in the good of man. If our consistency is doubted, are not we disappointed? So, too, was Jesus.

2. *Jesus' Confidence*.—Had Jesus' judgment of Himself depended on the opinion of men regarding Him, His disappointment with His disciples would have shaken His confidence in Himself. For how often does a man begin to distrust himself when others show any doubt of him. But if we read the gospel record carefully, we shall discover that Jesus' confidence grew as popularity waned and opposition waxed. He meets Philip's request with this assurance that no other theophany than Himself is needed or can suffice—'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' Self-confidence is not usually regarded as an admirable trait. How can that be excellence in Jesus which is generally a defect in other men? We must not cut the Gordian knot by at once appealing to His Divinity, as His Divinity was revealed in perfect humanity.

(1) Self-confidence is generally so objectionable because it is unjustified. It rests on ignorance and not knowledge of self. Jesus both knew Himself, and was as He knew Himself. The judgment of the Church has confirmed His self-judgment.

(2) There is a humility which, as unreal because

unrelated to truth, is just as objectionable. A man should be true and just to himself as well as to others; and he should not libel himself in speech, manner, or conduct to others. It is better for a man to under- than to over-estimate himself; but exaggeration in either direction is equally marked by falsity. A man may fail by this false humility to do the work, give the example, or wield the influence for which he is fitted and God intended him. The best use of powers depends on the true knowledge of the possession of them. Jesus knew Himself, and must judge Himself as Son of God.

(3) The nature of a man's work determines the degree of confidence he must hold in his fitness for it and call to it. The harder the task a man must face, the greater the trust in his power to accomplish it he must command. No battles would be won by the general doubtful of his strategy. It was Jesus' vocation to reveal God as Father; how could He make men certain of God as Father, unless He was Himself confident that He as Son knew God, and was able to inspire others with this confidence in Himself? The world's certainty of God's Fatherhood waited on His confidence in His own Sonship.

(4) His relation to God as Son was one of such constant dependence and entire submission, as well as intimate communion, that His confidence was not so much self-confidence as confidence in God. He was sure of Himself only as He was sure of God. So, too, the Christian, confessing his own insufficiency apart from God, may yet boast his sufficiency in God. When Paul exclaimed, 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me,' he was not applauding himself, but adoring Christ. So Jesus in His confidence as Son was glorifying His Father.

3. *Jesus' Surprise.*—'How sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?' Jesus feels, and cannot but feel, surprise that Philip has not discovered the truth so certain to Himself. He who loved freely, trusted fully, hoped firmly, could not understand the lack of love, faith, hope in the disciples, which hindered their knowledge and understanding of Himself. If His perfection was a barrier to their understanding of Him, their imperfection was a barrier to His understanding of them. By His insight He often knew what they were thinking and feeling; but nevertheless their inner life was often a perplexity to Him. To God surely iniquity remains a mystery. A good man when he witnesses some forms of evil of which he himself would be incapable is forced to cry out, 'Oh, how could he do it?' It was no defect in Jesus, but an

excellence, that His attitude to God, so different from the attitude of the disciples to Himself, made their attitude a surprise.

Has our Lord and Saviour the same ground for being surprised at our lack of love, faith, or hope regarding Him? Have we frustrated His constant efforts to reveal God to us, and to redeem us unto God? If we confess such failure, should we not further press the question whether it is because our religion is a second-hand influence of the Church, and not a first-hand experience of Christ Himself? Only as we make the venture of faith in Christ shall we know Him as the Son of God, see in Him the Father, and be so satisfied that we shall not desire any other revelation of God.

Thou seemest human and divine,
The highest, holiest manhood, thou :
Our wills are ours, we know not how ;
Our wills are ours, to make them thine.¹

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Doubt.

'And the Pharisees came forth, and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him. And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek after a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation.'—Mk 8^{11, 12}.

'Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.'—Jn 20²⁷.

So doubting Thomas is given the sign that was refused to the inquiring Pharisees. Why is the treatment different in the two cases? Why are the Pharisees rebuked for inability to read the signs of the times, while Thomas, who had doubted the plain statement of the Apostles, supported as it was by the emptiness of the tomb, receives no rebuke, but is given the very sign that he demands? The answer to this question will tell us a good deal about the kind of faith and loyalty that our Lord demands.

Our forefathers used to think that any doubt with regard to religious doctrines was wicked; it was necessary that they should be reminded of the sympathy which our Lord showed for the doubts of St. Thomas. We are more inclined to look on any doubt with regard to religious doctrines as a fine thing, which marks us as what men call 'advanced'—though very often it is only retrograde; and it is necessary for us to be reminded

¹ A. E. Garvie, *The Master's Comfort and Hope*, 103.

that the Pharisees were condemned for requiring a sign. We feel inclined to protest that this was very proper scientific procedure ; of course they would not commit themselves to a position that was possibly dangerous and certainly eccentric until they had been persuaded by absolutely convincing evidence. But we see the real quality of this would-be scientific temper when it jeers beneath the Cross, ' Let him come down from the cross and we will believe on him.'

Their demand for evidence was not prompted by a love of truth. They did not wish to believe ; on the contrary, they wished not to believe, and they demanded the sign from heaven precisely because they believed that He could not give it ; they were ready to take His refusal as a confession of inability, and therefore an excuse for their disbelief. And so their desire for a sign was itself a sufficient reason for refusing to give the sign ; for had it been given, their reason would have been convinced while their hearts were still unconvinced ; and that is perhaps the worst thing that can befall a man. To think our Lord is the revelation of God and to wish He weren't is about as far from discipleship as a man can be. And so our Lord deliberately leaves the Pharisees in unbelief rather than convince them against their will.

In just the same way the appearances of our Lord after His resurrection were granted only to those who knew and loved Him. There was no public manifestation to all the multitude ; but He appeared to Mary Magdalene, to James, to Cephas, to the eleven Apostles, to five hundred brethren. And to one who had been a devoted friend He gave the full proof that was needed to remove his doubts.

St. Thomas seems to have been a rather literal-minded man. When our Lord had said, ' Whither I go, ye know the way,' he replied, ' We know not whither thou goest ; how know we the way ? ' But though he was prosaic, he was utterly loyal. When our Lord determined to go to wake Lazarus from the sleep of death, though the Jews had sought to kill Him when He was last in Jerusalem, it was St. Thomas who said, ' Let us also go that we may die with him.' His refusal to believe in the Lord's resurrection was no failure in loyalty, as was St. Peter's denial. The insight of faith which can grasp the truth by perception of its quality is something better than St. Thomas's doubt ; ' blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed ' ; this insight, which is really a part of imagination, St. Thomas lacked.

Thomas Hardy was speaking for thousands of

honest doubters in his extraordinary poem, ' God's Funeral ' :

I saw a slowly-stepping train,
Lined on the brows, scoop-eyed, and bent and hoar,
Following in files across a twilit plain.
A strange and mystic form the foremost bore.

O man-projected Figure, of late
Imaged as we, thy knell who shall survive ?
Whence came it we were tempted to create
One whom we can no longer keep alive ?

Then in the background some I saw—
Sweet women, youths, men, all incredulous—
Who chimed, ' This is a counterfeit of straw ;
This requiem, mockery ! God still lives to us.'

And they composed a crowd, of whom
Some were right good, and many nigh the best.
Thus dazed and puzzled, 'twixt the gleam and gloom,
Mechanically I followed with the rest.

There is a story of an Arab chief who was reported to have been killed in battle. His wealth passed to his two sons, being equally divided between them. One day the news arrived that the chief had not been killed but only wounded, and was now returning to his home. One of his sons believed this, and was angry because he would have to surrender his portion of the inheritance ; the other would not believe it, but was ready for any sacrifice if the news might prove to be true. One believed what he was told and the other disbelieved ; but the believer was disloyal and the disbeliever loyal.

The belief of our minds is not something unimportant ; for it will influence our affections and our conduct ; and it will influence the belief and thereby the affections and conduct of our friends. Moreover, the knowledge of truth is one of the greatest aims of human life. But in the spiritual life the heart counts for more than the head ; loyalty of purpose is more important than correctness of doctrine.

In the days when he fought religious doubt and triumphed, Horace Bushnell, thrusting his hands through his black, bushy hair, cried out desperately, yet triumphantly, ' O men ! what shall I do with these arrant doubts I have been nursing for years ? When the preacher touches the Trinity and when logic shatters it all to pieces, I am all at the four winds. But I am glad I have a heart as well as a head. My heart wants the Father ; my heart wants the Son ; my heart wants the Holy Ghost—and one just as much as the other.'¹

¹ H. T. Kerr, *The Gospel in Modern Poetry*, 61.

People sometimes lament that the great fact of our Lord's resurrection should be recorded for us in such a way as may fail to convince men's minds. If everything turned on it, they say, why is the evidence for it allowed to be anything short of irresistible? Why should it be possible for honest men to doubt?

But if the evidence were convincing, the truth would be the prey of mere intellectual cleverness; we should grasp the truth here in the same kind of way that we grasp it—if we ever do—in geometry; and it would be most easily reached by the same people in this case as in that. But our Lord's method was always to reveal Himself only to those who loved Him; His Divinity is concealed by the veil of His Humanity from all except those who, loving Him as Man, try to take His life as their own and so pass 'through the veil, that is to say His flesh,' to the Divine secret that lies behind it.

It is the doubting heart, not the doubting mind, that is sinful. The doubts that are wrong come from the levity of mind that can see nothing great or noble, or from the clouded conscience when a man persuades himself that he may lawfully indulge in some forbidden pleasure. But perplexity of mind is no sin, if only the heart and will be loyal.¹

Professor Royce asserts that 'a study of history shows that if there is anything that human thought and cultivation have to be deeply thankful for, it is an occasional, but truly great and fearless age of doubt.' And in individuals it is only by facing obstinate questionings that faith is freed from folly and attains reasonableness.

Nor can religious experience, however boldly it claims to know, fail to admit that its knowledge is but in part. Our knowledge of God, like the knowledge we have of each other, is the insight born of familiarity; but no man entirely knows his brother. And as for the Lord of heaven and earth, how small a whisper do we hear of Him! Some minds are constitutionally ill-adapted for fellowship with Him because they lack what Keats calls 'negative capability'—'that is, when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason. Coleridge, for instance, would let go a fine isolated verisimilitude, caught from the Penetralium of mystery, from being incapable of remaining content with half-knowledge.' We have to trust God with His secrets, as well as try to penetrate them as far as our minds will carry us. We have to

accustom ourselves to look uncomplainingly at darkness, while we walk obediently in the light. 'They see not clearliest who see all things clear.'²

PALM SUNDAY.

The Contrasts of Palm Sunday.

'Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass.'—Mt 21⁶.

When a great general returned to Rome after a signal conquest, he was often welcomed to the city with 'a triumph.' It was a wonderful spectacle, and its traces are still to be seen in the old Roman Forum, in those magnificent triumphal arches through which the conqueror passed on his way to the Temple of Jove, there to offer sacrifice to the gods for the victory vouchsafed him.

Now this story may be truly called the triumph of Jesus. He was coming into the city which He loved and for which He was soon to die. He was coming after a life of the most wonderful victories over sin and sorrow and death; and He was doing so to crown them with the greatest victory of all—the Cross. It was therefore seemly that He should enter His capital city in triumph. He wished it to be so because He claimed to be its Messianic King, but how different His triumph from that of an earthly king! Here is no gaudy triumph or marble arches. All is meek and lowly and unpretending. 'Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass,' yea, 'upon a colt, the foal of an ass.'

1. We are at once arrested by the contrast between the central Figure of the scene and the surrounding spectators of it; the contrast of a sorrowing Saviour and a rejoicing multitude. It has been suggested that the whole conception of this triumphal entry was distasteful to Jesus. 'It was,' says the late Professor David Smith, 'a piece of acting, and pleasing as it was to the multitude, it was very distasteful to Him.' We cannot accept such a view. It is derogatory to the Master to think of Him as acting any part in which He did not believe. No, this was the whole meaning of the story, that He did claim to be a King and that in this triumphal entry into the city of David He was asserting His right to be called the Son of David. The cheers of the multitude were, therefore, not distasteful to Him and still less were the Hosannas of the children. He welcomed them and said, 'If these

¹ W. Temple, *Studies in the Spirit and Truth of Christianity*, 121.

² H. S. Coffin, *Some Christian Convictions*, 38.

should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.'

Nevertheless, though Jesus welcomed this triumph, there is this much truth in Dr. Smith's view, that He Himself was widely separated in feelings from those that gathered round Him to join it. Picture some great procession to-day in which the central figure of its cheering thousands is himself burdened by some secret sorrow or fear (such, for example, as attended the Archduke of Austria on the day of that fatal ride of his through the streets of Sarajevo), and we have a picture of Jesus as He listened to the resounding 'Hosannas' of the multitude on that first Palm Sunday.

What is the lesson to learn from this first contrast? Is it not this, that while the instincts of the multitude are right, they need to be wisely directed? The common folk welcomed Jesus because they knew He was their friend.

The instincts of democracy are on the side of Christ, if only we can get to its deepest heart. The working man has no real quarrel with Christ. His quarrel is that the Church does not represent Christ, and while he is often sadly led astray as to what the Church teaches, there is no doubt that sometimes he has a good case to make out for his complaint. There is far too much class-feeling in the modern Church. What we need is more of the spirit of the Democrat of Nazareth, who, as He beheld the multitudes, had compassion on them.

2. We notice this further contrast in the Triumph of Jesus, *a contrast between a steadfast Saviour and a fickle crowd*. That is finely brought out by Munkácsy in his great picture called 'Ecce Homo!' On the one side there is the howling Eastern mob crying out their execrations with distorted faces and garments, torn by fanatical passion, and on the other there is the calm, steadfast countenance of Jesus as He looked across this angry sea to the joy set before Him. He 'heeded not reviling tones.'

It has no doubt been suggested that the multitudes who cried 'Hosanna' to Him on Olivet were not the same as those who said 'Crucify' on Calvary. The one was the people of Galilee who loved Him; the other, the Jerusalem mob, stirred up by Priest and Pharisee. This is true; but it cannot be denied that the former made no effort to save Him, but weakly and cowardly stood by when He was delivered into the hands of wicked men. Some of them may have even joined in the roar of execration at the last. It is nothing new for the hero of to-day to be the martyr of to-

morrow. 'I lived for my country,' said Louis Kossuth, 'and therefore I die in exile.' Christ well knew how fickle were the promises of men. 'The hour cometh, and even now is, when ye shall leave me alone.' Yet there is no wavering.

So in our battle of life, whatever it be, whether in a great public struggle for righteousness or in a private fight with some secret sin or fear, we too have need of 'the kingdom of Christ's patience.' In every such battle there are ups and downs, Olivets of ringing cheers and Gethsemanes of bitter tears. At one hour we shall have the palm branch waving round us, and at another feel the chill shadow of the Cross; and what we need, to steady our souls in the midst of such contrasts of experience, is to fix our eyes on this Christ of Palm Sunday—to watch His calm face as He rides on amid the palm-waving crowd and sees beyond it 'a little hill called Calvary,' . . . sees it, but does not flinch.

3. Last of all there is a contrast here *between the Saviour approaching the most glorious, and Jerusalem approaching the most shameful, act in their respective histories*. Christ was entering Jerusalem to die, but still it was His triumph. True are the words of the Apostle to the Hebrews, 'Now we see Jesus, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.'

Ride on! ride on in majesty!
In lowly pomp ride on to die;
Bow Thy meek head to mortal pain,
Then take, O God, Thy power, and reign.

While Jesus, by the Via Dolorosa, was thus marching on to glory, the city by the same road was marching to its doom. What to the one was a 'savour of life unto life' was to the other a 'savour of death unto death.'

Behind the conqueror in the Roman triumph there usually followed a train of specially selected captives, won by him in his wars. Some of these, when the journey's end was reached, were set free to show forth the clemency of the conqueror; while others were put to death to show his power.

It is this twofold result of the triumph of Christ Paul speaks of when he says, 'To them that are being saved we are a savour of life unto life; to them that are perishing we are a savour of death unto death.' It was seen in Christ's first triumph. To Him and to His believers it was a savour of life unto life; but to Jerusalem and its priests it was a savour of death unto death.

This is the last and greatest lesson we learn from the contrasts of Palm Sunday. The Triumph of

Jesus never ends. From age to age the King of Glory passes on His way; but still as in the past His triumph has a twofold significance.

God give us grace to make the wise decision, and

as He this day passes before us to the Calvary of His life, may it be ours to crown Him 'Lord of all.'¹

¹ W. M. Mackay, *Days of the Son of Man*, 87.

General Revelation in the Theology of Emil Brunner.

BY DAVID CAIRNS, B.A., ABERDEEN.

IN spite of the general agreement of viewpoint among the dialectical theologians, there is a healthy independence of each other, which in some matters goes beyond a mere difference of emphasis. Emil Brunner is by no means a paler copy of Karl Barth—the truth being rather that both are deeply influenced by the same thinkers and personalities, e.g. Kierkegaard, Blumhardt, Kutter. The reason for the writing of the present article is that British readers may learn something of Brunner's teaching about general revelation, which is interestingly different from Barth's.

Three years ago Brunner wrote in *Zwischen den Zeiten* (the periodical of the dialectical theology) the following words: 'Now that the antithesis between nature and grace is in some degree understood, it is high time for us to apply ourselves with the greatest industry to the problem of general revelation in all its phenomena. To reject from the outset a natural theology in every sense of the word is neither Pauline nor Reformed, however great the danger of the modern thought of continuity may be at this point.'

We can perhaps elucidate this sentence by showing where Brunner agrees with Barth, and where he parts company with him. They are agreed in rejecting the Roman Catholic conception of natural revelation which we may describe as the two-storey conception. According to this view in the sphere of ethics there are certain virtues which the natural man can in his own strength perfectly practise, and certain things which, through the light of Nature, he can quite certainly know about God and his duty. What is given by the special revelation is a further and supernatural grace. The coming of the special revelation does not alter that structure of knowledge and action which is already there; it merely affirms it. On this 'basement' of general revelation the 'first floor' of special revelation is built up. All this is utterly opposed to Brunner's teaching as it is to Barth's.

Another point of full agreement between Barth and Brunner is that they make a sheer difference between special and general revelation. One has only space here to indicate that they believe that the Ritschlian reaction against the relativism of Schleiermacher's Christology was not radical enough, and so logically slipped back into the relativism of Troeltsch and the Historico-Scientific school. Brunner believes that the dialectical theology has managed to make a clear distinction between general and special revelation. But now he fears that in avoiding Scylla some of his comrades are in peril from Charybdis.

The denial of general revelation in every sense is, he believes, particularly dangerous in face of the world situation which to-day confronts the Church. Missionaries know that they must find a point of contact (*Anknüpfungspunkt*) for the gospel in the conscience, religion, or customs of their hearers. And what forces itself as sheer necessity on the missionary is only seemingly a less urgent necessity for every preacher. The situation is everywhere rapidly becoming a missionary situation, the Church is everywhere faced by a world which does not understand churchly or theological language. In the article quoted above Brunner says: 'Especially in a time when all consciousness of God is diminishing, it will not do . . . to treat that consciousness of him which remains . . . as if it were not there, or of no significance. . . . By such a proceeding we can only spoil our opportunity of getting a hearing; for the man who, without being a Christian, knows something of God, will not let himself be persuaded that he knows nothing about him.' Brunner is also fond of quoting a saying of Luther's that it is as effective to preach to cattle as to men whose consciences you do not touch, and this principle is a central one in the practical instructions on preaching which it is one of his duties as Professor to give.

Starting ourselves from the standpoint of Christian

faith, we must ask what, apart from indirect Christian influences, are the nature and extent of the non-Christian's knowledge of God. To get an answer we must take two propositions from the Christian doctrine of man. Man is created by God and fallen in sin. We cannot, however, take the first proposition, that man is created by God, and proceed to infer from it that there remains to-day in reason or conscience, any completely sound part which would suffice to give us a wholly trustworthy picture of God or our duty. Man was created by God to find his freedom in love and obedience to the divine will. Man has misused that freedom, has tried to break loose from God from the 'Grace of Creation.' But here we must not go too far in asserting man's depravity, for man has not been able to shake off from himself his relation to God. For to do that would be no less than to destroy his humanity and to become a beast.

Apart from theological presuppositions let us look at the facts of human nature. What makes man specifically human? In everything he does he seems to be necessarily related to the Absolute. He alone of all creation seems to feel the compulsion of the norm, the moral imperative in the Practical Reason and the idea of truth and the Absolute in the Theoretical Reason. He alone of all creation can be false to his nature—inhuman, unreasonable. Solipsist or sceptic man may be in theory, no one ever was so in life; every man who is not insane acts like a reasonable creature. The Christian theologian interprets this fact of general anthropology in his own way. What all reasonable beings see as the relation to the Absolute is more truly interpreted by Christian theology as relationship to God. If not in the right relationship to God, man is not merely neglected by Him; much more terrible, he stands in a perverted relation to God, before divine wrath.

Now human nature and the range and quality of our natural knowledge of God must be interpreted in the light of this double principle of the grace of Creation and sin. In our humanity the two elements are inextricably intermingled. That very grace which makes it impossible for us to escape from God into mere animality, forbids us, now that we have sinned, to escape from guilt and divine anger. We shall be prepared, then, to see in all human activities a search for God inextricably united with a flight from Him, and in all human knowledge, elements which the special revelation affirms and crowns, and elements which it denies. The relation of the Christian Revelation to the natural man and his Reason is a double-

sided one of affirmation and negation. One may comment that here in Brunner we have no flippant dialectic, but rather a view which must be held by all who believe in the truth of the Christian Revelation and its transcendence of general revelation, and cannot accept the Roman Catholic 'two-storey' scheme. Let us finish by taking a few spheres in which the special revelation comes into touch with human life and see what is affirmed and what negated. I propose to touch on the Christian doctrine of man in relation to the natural man's knowledge of himself, the relation between special revelation and Philosophy, the relation of Christian knowledge of God to the philosophical idea of the Absolute and Moral Imperative, and the relation between the special revelation and man's religious tendencies.

Firstly, let us consider the natural man's knowledge of himself—the unsystematized subject-matter of a Natural Anthropology or Doctrine of Man. It is this self-knowledge in his hearer which becomes the point of connexion for the preacher; the true preacher must make the ordinary man say, 'What he says is true of me'; he must become conscious of sin, of the unsatisfying nature of his life without God, of the restless search which is the inner meaning of his life; and yet it is only in the light of the confidence that God has forgiven him, that he needs no longer to strive to reach God, but can begin again with the assumption of the divine forgiveness and presence with him; it is only when he knows this, that a man can tell what the true nature of his sin was, and what the real meaning of human life is. The Christian Doctrine of Man is not the same as that of the natural man, but there is enough 'overlap' to win the ear of the natural man: to convince him of the truth of the Christian doctrine the work of the Holy Spirit is necessary.

We pass to the second subject. To give an adequate account of Brunner's conception of the relation between Philosophy and special revelation would itself require a long article. Here there is room for merely the briefest account. Brunner cannot too strongly condemn the attacks made on the Reason in the name of Intuition. 'Scheler's statement that the Logos is an invention of the Greeks is merely ridiculous,' he tells his students, 'for the Logos is the backbone of human existence.' Brunner's position with regard to Reason is largely the Kantian one: so long as it is dealing with the subject-matter of experience Reason is in its own sphere and unassailable; so soon as it ventures beyond this function, taking,

like Idealist speculation, the concept of coherence as one from which to construct the picture of the whole of Reality—or, so soon as like Realist Metaphysics, it argues from analogy beyond the sphere of possible experiment (Aristotle)—the Reason is embarked on a voyage without a harbour. The frequent struggles and mutual confutations and the incessant recrudescence of such systems warn us that here we are dealing with an activity of the human mind which may have an æsthetic justification, but is not, strictly speaking, thought at all. The true Philosophy is one which restricts itself within its own sphere and refuses to take metaphysical theories or speculations as constitutive of reality. But Reason, when left to itself, will always wander into those realms, and attempt to dictate to the universe. Here the special revelation affirms the legitimate use of Reason, but curbs it when it attempts to make itself the final arbiter of the universe. There is only one court of higher instance than the human Reason, and that is God.

Thirdly, let us consider the relation in Brunner's theology of the special revelation to the Idea of the Absolute, and to the Idea of the Categorical Imperative, the norms of the Theoretical and Practical Reason respectively. The Idea of the Absolute is a limiting concept. We try to conceive of it as that which is entirely independent of ourselves, but as soon as we think it, it becomes merely the object of our thought: an idea which we set up. However hard we try to leap beyond the circle of our own thought, even if we describe the Absolute as 'that about which we cannot even be silent,' we have described something in terms of our world, and therefore have come short of that which is wholly independent of our world. There is no way from the human mind to the Absolute. But suppose that that God whom man on his own initiative could never truly reach were to enter man's world, were Himself to take the initiative, revealing Himself as Creator and unconditioned love, would we not find in that God a person who reveals Himself as more absolute than our Idea of the Absolute? If this be so, we have in this sphere the usual relation of the special revelation to the General, which we have come to expect. God in His special revelation denies the truth of the Idea. He is Person, not idea; He is concrete and subject, all idea is abstract and object. But the Idea is not wholly done away; it is in part affirmed. It remains and has a critical function. Reason gives us the right to say, 'At all events I know that God can't be less absolute than my Idea of the Absolute.'

The case is similar with regard to the Ethical Imperative. Perhaps the deepest conception of that Imperative which man has attained to is the idea of a law binding upon all persons. The essence of all law is that it is abstract, impersonal and general; individual actions are considered right if they can be subsumed under the general law or not prohibited by it. When St. Paul refers to the Law it is often to this wider moral law that he refers, and not to the special law of the Hebrew people. Now the special revelation—the gospel, stands by no means in a merely negative relation to the Law so conceived. We all know how Paul had to fight against Antinomianism. As the Logos is the backbone of thought, so is the Law the backbone of moral action. God's law and anger are the last decisive reality—for him who does not know of God's inexplicable forgiveness. If the Law is transcended by the gospel, it is because the gospel achieves and affirms the purposes at which the Law aimed. But if we must say that nowhere is the Law so affirmed as in the Cross, we must also say that nowhere is it so royally cast aside. The Cross is God's proof of His justice, proof that infringement of the Law could not be merely passed over; and yet that infringement is here blotted out by forgiveness. The Law is the only way in which a fallen world was able to come in touch with God outside of His special Revelation, but the Law can also come between God and man, and stand in the way of the gospel and grace. Taken seriously it led to despair, taken not seriously it led to moral arrogance and Pharisaism. Here, again, in the sphere of moral activity we see the dialectical nature of the relation of Special Revelation to General Revelation. The former affirms and at the same time negates the latter—affirms its general aim and purpose, and negates its error and inadequacy.

Finally, we have to deal with the relation between the religious tendencies in man and the Special Revelation. Brunner admits the universal existence of a religious instinct in man. This is not, however, a human faculty for grasping God—the content of man's religious consciousness includes abominations as well as highly ethical worship. It is not possible to make a unitary picture of Religion in general. What is possible is an understanding for the Christian of the various religions from the central point of Christianity. In Christianity the believer sees, as it were, the harmonious and perfect unity of the various tendencies which war together irreconcilably in the religions. As the religions develop and are purified they lose not only their

primitive and sub-rational element, which is a gain, but also their sense of the transcendent; they become rationalized, one might almost say secularized, and this is a loss. Each one of the world religions may be said to be in some one sense nearer to Christianity than the others. The gospel affirms some elements in all; in all of the religions there is much which it must deny. For example, Zoroaster's conception of God as holy and personal is to be affirmed, but his belief that the good man is justified by works is to be denied. For those who are not believers in Christ this centrality of Christianity is not visible—for to them Christianity is itself more or less a jumble of contradictions.

Religion is, in part, a search after God, in part

a flight from Him. And this is true of the religiousness of us Christians too. It is Christianity as God's revelation to us, not our religion and piety which stand over against the religion of the world. Apart from grace every man worships idols, inasmuch as his picture of God is, in part, false. The conscious atheist may be, like Nietzsche, a seeker after God, and much Christianity is a flight from God. How much true reverence does there not lie in the words 'Écrasez l'infame!'? How much true and just reaction against false pictures of God? We are reminded also of the just element in the reactions of Bolshevism. It is only in Christ that the religious find their goal, but here also they find their end.

The Authority of Conscience.

BY THE REVEREND ARCHIBALD CHISHOLM, D.LITT., GLASGOW.

'It is as hard to get a conviction of sin in the courts of God,' we are told by an American writer, 'as to get a conviction of Volstead violation in the courts of New York.' Moral standards have been questioned and in many instances undermined; modes of morality which prevailed in a former generation have been exchanged for codes of life which seem to be based on no guiding principles. Yet during the period in which there has been outwardly so definite a revolt against former standards the balance has been evenly held by the leaders in ethical thought who, while prepared to accept the further insight into the operations of the human mind which has come through the medium of psychology, have stood by what is essential in the old positions.

About twenty-five years ago Professor Westermarck, in his book *Moral Ideas*, outlined very fully the arguments in favour of subjectivism in ethics. He realized that he would be liable to attack on the ground that subjectivity in morality would lead to laxity in life; that if he dethroned the moral imperatives, removing them from the realm of reality which human questioning could not invade and placing them among the products of tradition, he would be regarded as undermining morality. His answer was that no individual would obey moral dictates any the less even although uncertain of their being universally objective. 'If I make

them control me, that is enough.' In spite of the force of his argument, and the ability with which others who held the same standpoint supported this position, in his recent volume, *Ethical Relativity*, he has to admit that the whole trend of ethical thought has been against his position, and consequently he has to affirm more boldly than ever the point of view which he formerly outlined. 'A good conscience is little more than the absence of a bad one.' Conscience, he maintains, does not provide us with moral judgments possessed of objective validity, but these judgments are relative to the emotions they express, and these emotions in turn are the product of tradition and custom which find their origin in 'a generalization of emotional tendencies transmitted from generation to generation.'

It will be generally admitted that if conscience is no more than the voice of certain 'retributive emotions' which rally in support of the *status quo*, it loses much of its prestige. One reason why there has been no great readiness to accept this point of view is to be found in the fact that the concept of conscience displays itself in so many ways which force us to regard it as belonging to the realm of essential values. The Freudians describe it as the Super-ego keeping watch over the 'primordial, unconscious, instinctive, unmoral, pleasure-loving, pain-hating, passionate, illogical Id.' It makes

'cowards of us all,' but at other times displays itself in the heroism which for a good cause can endure the greatest hardship. Even as the theory, that God is a projection of personality, tends to break down when we remember how the Mystics in their search after illumination had to pass through the 'Dark Night of the Soul,' thus enduring an experience which is inexplicable if what they felt they had been denied was only a product of their own minds, so the operations of conscience are so compelling that it is difficult to account for them on any purely subjective grounds. The strange ethical phenomenon of 'a crime of conscience' in which an individual who is conscious of wrong-doing but has gone unpunished, actually commits some other crime in the hope that he may be detected and punished and thus find some release from his mental agony, makes it difficult to accept the lower standpoint. Whatever kind of reality we grant to it, whether such, for example, as Professor Eddington posits of God when he compares Deity to 'the shadow of the Great War on Armistice Day,' or the fuller reality which C. E. Joad allows when he speaks of the goal of life as being 'a non-human reality, perfect as we are imperfect, the revelation of a reality beyond our consciousness,' we must do justice to conscience as an elemental force in every human life.

An adequate theory must also do justice to the varying forms in which the 'inner voice' has spoken. In the sphere of metaphysics, solipsism received considerable support from those who were impressed by the variations apparent in our consciousness of the world around us. Berkeley's *Theory of Vision* has had its counterpart in ethics. Professor G. E. Moore, in his *Principia Ethica*, held that duty and expediency do not differ from each other, and although there is considerable modification in his later volume *Ethics*, he still contends that there is no absolute end from which actions derive their rightness. It is a commonplace that ethical standards have changed. At one time prayer was offered regularly on the Baltic coasts that God might send the people many shipwrecks; and later when the mediæval Church succeeded in persuading its members that mercy was to be shown to those who had suffered shipwreck, there was no demand that infidels who had suffered loss on the sea should receive any mercy. In Frankfort stern opposition was manifested, on conscientious grounds, when some new machines were erected; the developing standpoint regarding slavery, war, and other issues, all seems to support the contention that the goal of morality is not static in any sense

of the word. It is, of course, admitted that there is some end towards which humanity seems to be striving, but it is not admitted that this goal is, *a priori*, enthroned in the realm of eternal values.

Any theory of conscience which fails to do justice to the impelling power of conscience, which would regard it as less insistent than Freud's *Libido* or Bergson's *élan vital*, must be inadequate; and again, any theory which does not take cognizance of the fact that the perception of the moral end, granted to any generation, is in great measure dependent on tradition and thus relative, must be regarded as defective. Both points of view receive justice among those who lay emphasis on 'equilibrium,' 'wholeness' (as in Smuts), or, to use Raup's phrase, 'complacency,' as the end of human striving. Professor Köhler explains conscience on the ground that it is part of the impulse to 'dynamical self-distribution.' The objective aimed at is determined by past experience, because the satisfaction sought is conditioned by what has already been attained. On the other hand, the drive onward is very powerful, because the personality cannot be at rest until it has attained the higher and more complex order for which its dissatisfaction makes it strive. Personality does not seek 'equilibrium' in any existing or previous condition; it goes out beyond itself to an ideal of completeness, in part determined by past attainment even as the sector of a circle determines the way in which the circle must be completed. These theories, however helpful, do not provide us with the justification of conscience which Christian morality demands. We require to be able to speak of the dominant demands of the 'inner voice' with the assurance we find in Carlyle, in Kant, or in Fichte. 'There is something,' says Fichte, 'which must be done for its own sake, that which conscience demands of me in this particular situation of life. It is mine to do, and for this purpose only I am here.'

It may be that even as in religion we are provided only with reasons for the existence of God rather than with such proofs as satisfy the logician, so in the realm of ethics we must base our ultimate argument for the objective validity of conscience on such reasons. Along this line Dr. Nicolai Hartmann investigates these questions in his exceptionally thorough volume on *Ethics*, which has just been translated by Stanton Coit. While doing justice to such contentions as have been dealt with above, he reaches the conclusion that 'Conscience is the influence of a higher power, a voice from another world—from the ideal world of values.'

He deals with the argument that our moral attitude is determined by tradition and by those great exemplars we have decided to follow. 'The Christian from the beginning has seen his moral exemplar in the figure of Jesus as the Evangelists draw it. He conceives of his own morality as an "imitation" of Christ. To him Jesus is the standard of good and evil, whether the question be concerning his own resolutions or the approval or disapproval of others.' Some would suggest that this is only further proof of the contention that even in religion the standard is arbitrary, in as much as it has been created for us by an historic personality, but Hartmann deals with this contention. The moral judgment as to values is not the result of the manifestation of these qualities in a personality, but men accept the pattern displayed in Christ because they have certain intuitive values of life as it ought to be lived. 'The choice of the model rests upon the moral judgment as to values. The values are *prius*, the conditioning factor. The consciousness of what is worthy of imitation is

nothing except a form of the aprioristic consciousness of value.'

The conclusions reached by Dr. Hartmann are in the line of the teaching of the chief ethical teachers; but as has so often happened, an age may forsake its real leaders, and in too many quarters it is assumed that conscience has been dethroned, that the demands of morality possess no ultimate authority. In this as in other spheres the principle of the pendulum operates. Action and reaction are as closely related as light and shadow, and when a generation begins to awaken to the fact that it is becoming materialistic, in all probability the reaction towards a more spiritual view of the universe has already set in. In these days when so many are telling us that the generation is betraying the moral standards of the past and forgetting that the spinal column of the universe is ethical, the reaction towards a standpoint which enthrones conscience and accepts the binding laws of morality, not as human conventions but as God-given ordinances, is already becoming apparent.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

THE Samaritan community is a small one, numbering less than two hundred souls, but it is of immense historical interest, as the passover celebrated by it is the one Old Testament sacrificial rite which persists in Palestine to this day. Apart from early Samaritan accounts of the festival, there are descriptions of it from the pen of European travellers and scholars who since 1850 have had the privilege of being present at it. In addition to a complete knowledge of the relevant literature, Professor Jeremias of Greifswald, during his stay in Palestine in 1931, had the good fortune to be present at the Samaritan passover on 1st May, and he seized the opportunity to take forty-eight excellent photographs of the scenery and of all the stages of the ritual process, which enormously increase the interest of his discussion,¹ and which he has good right to claim as unique. This history of the festival is carefully followed through the centuries, so far as the sources permit, and the evidence seems to show that originally the Samaritan passover was a family

festival, in this reflecting pre-Deuteronomic practice. The discussion is as lucid as it is learned, and it is a marvel that a book adorned with so many photographs on special paper has been published at so low a cost.

Professor Hänel, discussing 'The Word of God and the Old Testament,'² emphasizes the unity of both Testaments: the Old Testament is not only Law, and the New is not only Gospel. The unity of the Old Testament he finds to lie in its 'holiness,' its sense of the 'otherness' of God—a holiness which in places has very primitive as well as profound associations. The love of God is present in, though not exactly central to, the Old Testament, and the Cross of Christ is really the crown of Old Testament teaching. Indeed, there is nothing of fundamental importance in the New Testament which has not its counterpart in the Old Testament. Hänel insists, however, that the theological evaluation of the Old Testament must rest upon sound exegesis, to which the historico-critical method is indispensable. He therefore rightly rejects all attempts to super-

¹ *Die Passahfeier der Samaritaner* (Töpelmann, Giessen; pp. 109; Rm.9).

² *Das Wort Gottes und das Alte Testament* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; pp. 47; Rm.1.20).

impose an allegorical meaning. He leaves a place open, however, for typological interpretation, though this method would seem to be exposed to vagaries little less capricious than the allegorical. He is right, we may grant, in suggesting that each passage of Scripture should be considered in the light of the whole and of the Divine purpose of which it is the literary embodiment.

The articles in the current number¹ of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* are few but important. Hehn, discussing the traditional 'blood-bridegroom' of Ex 4²⁶, suggests, on the basis of the LXX, ἔστη τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς τοῦ παιδίου μου, יָלַד מִלַּחַת בֶּן מִלַּח, and explains thus: 'Jahweh threatens Moses with death because his son is not circumcised. Zipporah hastens to circumcise him, then throws herself prostrate at Jahweh's feet with the words: The circumcision of my child is now accomplished' (ἱσταναι fre-

¹ 1932, Heft 1 (Töpelmann, Giessen; Rm.5).

quently represents קִים). Professor C. R. North, of Birmingham, offers a profoundly interesting discussion of 'The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship,' in which he deals with the ancient belief in the magical powers of kings, the meaning of their anointing, and their exercise of priestly functions. Discussing with much exegetical and textual thoroughness the relevant passages, especially in the Psalter, the question whether the antique belief in the divinity of the king was current among the Hebrews, he concludes that 'however exalted among his brethren the king might be, his place was on the human rather than on the divine side of reality.' Budde continues with 3¹⁶ his minute textual and critical study of Is 1-5. He regards the list in 3¹⁶⁻²³ as genuine, also the much-disputed 4^{1-4a}, which he connects with 28^{5f}. With the 'Woes' of 5^{8ff} he associates 1²⁹⁻³¹ and 10¹⁻⁴. Thiersch discusses, with plans and illustrations, an old Mediterranean temple type.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Trinity College, Glasgow.

Contributions and Comments.

The Buddha and the Christ.

In your notice of my Bampton Lectures, *The Buddha and the Christ* (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, January 1933), it is said that: 'the general impression left on the reader's mind is that what the world needs is an eclectic theosophy which shall combine the best in Buddhism and Christianity.'

If that is so, the general impression I have succeeded in conveying is quite contrary to what I had intended. Westcott recommended people to study the Bible like any other book, in order to discover how unlike it is to any other. My intention was to suggest that, if one studies Christ like any other supreme religious teacher, one will make the similar discovery that he is unlike any other.

B. H. STREETER.

Queen's College, Oxford.

A Suggestion.

It is audacious to add another to the hundreds of emendations which lumber the commentaries on

Job; but I venture to submit one for the consideration of scholars. Right or wrong, it is only a 'little one.'

In 9³ we read, 'If he (God) be pleased to contend with him (*i.e.* with man), he will not answer him one in a thousand':

לֹא יַעֲנֵנִי אֶחָת מִנִּי-אַלֶּף:

which is usually interpreted, 'he will not answer him once in a thousand times'—not a very satisfactory rendering. If, however, we look at 33²³ we read, 'If there be an angel, an interpreter (or 'advocate'), one of the thousand'—one, that is, of the thousand angelic mediators between God and man. Remembering how fond Elihu is of quoting from speeches in the original portion of the poem, I propose in the present passage to change אֶחָת to אֶחָד, and to translate, 'If God chooses to enter into controversy with man, not even one of the thousand will become man's advocate.' As in old days, in cases of treason, the defendant had no counsel against the Crown, so in a lawsuit between God and man, the defendant had to plead his own cause without assistance.

That עָנָה can be used, with accusative, for 'answer for,' as well as for 'answer,' is sufficiently shown by Gn 30³³ and by other passages.

E. E. KELLETT.

London.

The Position of the Temple Cleansing in the Fourth Gospel.

THE Rev. Greville P. Lewis has done students of the Fourth Gospel a great service by developing in the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES an amended form of the theory which he propounded when a member of the Birmingham New Testament Seminar, and which he kindly allowed me to summarize in *The Fourth Gospel on Recent Criticism and Interpretation*. The theory frankly abandons the objective test of numerical calculation which gave to Spitta's earlier theory its chief attraction. It was this test which gave feasibility to the theories of those who followed in Spitta's steps, Mr. Warburton Lewis and Mr. J. M. Thompson, Dr. Bernard and Dr. Macgregor.

I must not take up space in these columns discussing ground which I have tried to cover in the book to which Mr. Lewis makes such kind reference, but on one point I may perhaps be allowed to write a few lines, the more so because your generous reviewer of that book raised the same issue. The reviewer wrote (xliii. p. 64): 'It may be doubted, in passing, whether the preference for the Johannine, instead of the Marcan, dating of the cleansing of the Temple is really justifiable.' To those of us who were brought up to think of the Marcan order as the one sure thing in Gospel chronology, it is not easy to think of the incident of the Temple cleansing as having any other place than during the last week of our Lord's life. In spite of the efforts of the *Formgeschichtler*, I still think that Mark preserves in rough outline the course of the ministry of Jesus in Galilee. But Mark records no visit of Jesus to Jerusalem until the last week. He has, therefore, no other place in which to anchor any floating traditions of conflicts between Jesus and the authorities at Jerusalem. In the second place, the old assumption that John is here opposed to the Synoptics as a whole has been undermined. In his Passion narrative, Luke relies upon a peculiar source. This did not contain the story of the Cleansing of the Temple, for here we find what is obviously an insertion from Mark in the narrative of Proto-Luke. This fact was brought out clearly

by Dr. Vincent Taylor in *Behind the Third Gospel* (pp. 95 f.). He went so far as to say then, 'On its merits, the earlier Johannine date for this incident is preferable, but the additional evidence afforded by the silence of Proto-Luke and by the Third Gospel itself is decisive' (*ibid.*, 238).

Now, in his latest book, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (p. 179 n.), Dr. Taylor approaches the question again, though from a different angle. Considering the matter in the light of *Formgeschichte* he writes: 'Having always preferred the Johannine date of the Cleansing, I am naturally interested in the possibility that here we may have a suggestion of the way in which Mark comes to associate this event with the Last Week.' It seems to me that Mr. Lewis must deal with these considerations before determining that the case for the rejection of the Johannine position of this incident is very strong. Mr. Lewis asks, 'Could Jesus, as a comparatively unknown provincial, have thus routed the powerful vested interests of the Temple?' Johannes Weiss, even when discussing this story in its Marcan setting, says that success was achieved only by the personality of Jesus, whose clear consciousness of right, expressing itself with irresistible power of will and prophetic zeal, triumphed over the bad conscience and hesitation of the traffickers, especially when the crowd shouted its approval of the reformer who had so unexpectedly appeared in their midst' (*Die Schriften des N.T.*, ed. 3, i. 179). Mr. Lewis's other difficulties are met by Johannes Weiss elsewhere, when he urges (a) that our Lord's zeal for the outward and ceremonial purity of the Temple is more in keeping with the opening of His ministry than at the close, after so much stress had been laid upon the supreme importance of the inwardness of true religion, and (b) His action would be more likely to succeed at a time when the hostility of the authorities had not yet been focused upon Him. There is yet one further point. Mr. Lewis asks with incredulity if the accusers of Jesus were quoting against Him (Mk 14⁶⁸), a two-year-old saying (Jn 2¹⁹). Yes, for if it had been spoken but a few days before when keen-witted and bitterly hostile agents were hanging upon His lips for evidence to quote against Him, it would not have taken so long to secure this saying as condemnatory self-witness. Perhaps we may even say that its misquotation is not due to malice altogether, but to vague and inaccurate remembrance of a saying half-forgotten by now.

I am grateful to Mr. Greville Lewis both for his brilliant article, and also for the opportunity it gives me to plead again that this chronological question

should be carefully studied once more without prejudice on either side.

W. F. HOWARD.

Birmingham.

A Note on the Work of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 'Ad Baptizandos.'

AFTER the sixth volume of my *Woodbrooke Studies*, containing the second part of the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ad Baptizandos*, had passed through the press—a book which exhibits one of the most important texts in the domain of Christian theology and Church history—I found two more quotations from it that had escaped my notice when I wrote the prefatory note to the volume. These quotations are very important, as they emanate from early Fathers, and it would be useful to draw the attention of scholars to them. One of them is by Facundus, an admirer of Theodore, and the other is by Cyril of Alexandria, a Father whose views on the Incarnation were not always in harmony with those of Theodore.

In perusing the second volume of the late Dr. Swete, *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Comment*, 1882, I found on p. 332 the following quotation of Theodore's book *Ad Baptizandos*, in the works of Facundus:

[Fac. iii. 2: 'tertio decimo libro codicis quem Mysticum appellavit.' Hesychius (*ap. Act. Conc. CP.* ii. v.): 'Mysticos Sermones.' Ebedjesu.]

'Book XIII.

Angelus diaboli est Samosatenus Paulus, qui purum hominem dicere praesumpsit dominum Iesum Christum, et negavit existentiam diuinitatis Unigeniti, quae est ante saecula.'

This quotation is found in the second part of Theodore's work *Ad Baptizandos*, as follows¹:

'An angel of Satan is Paul of Samosata, who asserted that Christ our Lord was a simple man, and denied (the existence) before the worlds of the person of the Divinity of the Only Begotten.'

This quotation proves that the division of the

¹ *Woodbrooke Studies*, vi. 40.

work of Theodore, in the manuscript of my collection, into two different books is not correct, because if we count the ten chapters of the first part of the work, dealing with the Commentary on the Nicene Creed, and the first three chapters of the second part, which deals with the Lord's Prayer and the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, we shall have thirteen chapters, which corresponds exactly with the thirteen chapters of Theodore's work as counted by Facundus. Theodore's work in the Greek manuscript lying before Facundus was, therefore, one continuous text, divided into sixteen chapters, ten of which belong to the part dealing with the Nicene Creed, and six to the second part, which in my Syriac manuscript deals with the Lord's Prayer and the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist.

Cyril of Alexandria's quotation is on pp. 326-327 of Swete's work:

[*Act. Conc. CP.* ii. v. ('Cyrillus. certe et in allocutionibus quas fecit ad baptizandos iterum dixit idem Theodorus.')]

'Hoc uero non ex nobis ipsis inuenimus testimonium, sed ex diuina edocti sumus scriptura; quoniam et beatus Paulus ita dicit; *ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus*; non quod ex Iudaeis et secundum carnem est, qui super omnia Deus est, sed hoc quidem ad significandam humanam naturam dixit, quam ab Israelitico genere esse sciebat; illud autem ad ostendendam diuinam naturam, quam supra omnia et omnibus dominantem sciebat.'

This quotation is found in the first part of Theodore's work as follows²:

'They did not make use of these words out of their own heads, but they took them from the teaching of Holy Writ. The blessed Paul said: "Of whom Christ is the flesh, who is God over all," not that He is God by nature from the fact that He is of the House of David in the flesh, but he said "in the flesh" in order to indicate the human nature that was assumed. He said "God over all" in order to indicate the Divine nature which is higher than all, and which is the Lord.'

A. MINGANA.

Selly Oak.

² *Woodbrooke Studies*, v. 37.

Entre Nous.

A Specialist's Reminiscences.

Dr. Greville Macdonald is well known to the reading world by the biography which he wrote of his father, George Macdonald. Dr. Macdonald was for many years an eminent Nose and Throat Specialist in Harley Street. In spite of the fact that he was afflicted throughout his working life with incurable deafness, he carried on for many years a very large practice. He has now retired at the age of sixty-eight, and has found time to write his reminiscences. They have been published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (*Reminiscences of a Specialist*; 16s. net). He depends to some extent on the letters which he wrote to his mother from quite early days, until her death in 1904. But his own memory for detail is extraordinary, and he has perhaps almost too much facility with his pen. He writes at considerable length on various distinguished men and women with whom he came in contact. There is, for example, a long chapter on Lord Lister and a full description of his method of operating; there is an account of all the circumstances of John Ruskin's divorce and the strange romance of Rose La Touche; and the tragedy of the distinguished surgeon Morell Mackenzie, who returned to England after his treatment of the Crown Prince Frederick to be knighted by Queen Victoria, but to find his splendid practice as a Throat Specialist gone. It was an advertisement for a house-surgeon to a throat hospital in London at a salary of £100 a year which gave Dr. Macdonald the chance of his life and brought him into touch with Morell Mackenzie. When the latter came back from Germany we are told he 'became less friendly, making it impossible for me to explain my rapid popularity; my brougham and pair, and my tastefully furnished house in his own street.'

The influence of Octavia Hill on him is interestingly described, and some quotations which specially impressed him are given. For example, what she wrote to a Quaker friend in 1874: 'You and I know that it matters little if we have to be the out-of-sight piers driven deep in the marsh, on which the visible ones are carried that support the bridge. We do not mind if hereafter people forget that there are any low down at all; if some have to be used up in trying experiments before the best way of building the bridge is discovered. . . . The bridge is what we care for, and not our place in it.'

There are some delightful descriptions of the beauties of Nature as we see them reflected in the

sensitive and receptive mind of the writer. 'This afternoon the weather cleared and we got the loveliest sight I have ever seen. Beauty perfectly unattainable! For if you get to that majestic, silent peak of the Matterhorn, silvered and radiant with snow and sun, against the eternal blue, miles and æons away, isolated in its grandeur from all the strivings of its Creator against the one Enemy Death; if at last you should reach it, all would be cold and heartless, bitter winds beating you to death. This perfection of Beauty would hold you to its heart and freeze the life out of you with its lovely arms. . . . A little before my visit to Switzerland, my father had gone there for the first time in his life. In his novel, *Wilfrid Cumbermede*, he relates, in words truer than any I could find, an experience almost identical with this, my arrestment by the Matterhorn's beauty. Ruskin, too, in his *Præterita*, tells of a similar revelation in his own youth: and I do not doubt that some such uplifting has been experienced by multitudes as a kind of *conversion*, even though the faculty of subjective vision must differ strangely in degree. "The fool sees not the same tree that the wise man sees," says William Blake; and nothing better instances it than this Alpine revelation. It lifted me out of my cubbish youth; and the memory of its magic has never left me: not even when my energies became almost absorbed in winning the world and chancing the loss.'

Let us finish with a quotation from an early letter to his father. It is dated December 6th, 1878.

' . . . Thank you for your letter about speaking the truth. I always try—I *think* I do—to be truthful. All the same I tell a great many petty lies, e.g. things that mean one thing to myself though another to other people. But I do not think lightly of it. Where I am more often wrong is in tacitly pretending I hear things which I do not, especially jokes and good stories, the *point* of which I always miss; but, seeing every one laugh, I laugh too, for the sake of not *looking* a fool. My respect for the world's opinion is my greatest stumbling-block, I fear. . . . '

Thoroughness.

'When I was nine, my father gave me a box of tools, and a little bench with an adorable vice that squeaked vilely but never held. They gave me infinite happiness, but only until, all too soon, the plane notched and blocked itself; the gouge, my

favourite because it made boats, became hopelessly jagged; the oil-stone refused the work of a grind-stone; and the saw, blunted by alien nails, demanded too much of my slack muscles. One recompense was an admonishment from my father over an attempt at box-making; and I have never forgotten it: "If ever you do anything badly and content yourself with saying, 'Oh, that'll have to do!' then you may be sure it *won't do at all!*" It represented well a stoic quality in his own creed: "God," he once said, "is not hard to please, but it is impossible to satisfy Him."¹

Decorations of Solomon's Temple.

The greatest of the discoveries reported in the last *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund* was a beautiful series of ivories which were found close to the spot where Ahab's 'house of ivory' must have stood. 'The style and subjects of the ivories suggest an immediate comparison with the decorations of the temple of Solomon. Figures borrowed from the Egyptian pantheon naturally would be ignored by Biblical writers, but most of our other subjects are mentioned not once but several times in the chapters devoted to Solomon's works (1 Kings vi.-x.). The "lions, oxen and cherubim," the "cherubim, lions, and palm trees," the "lions on the steps of the great throne of ivory," the "oxen beneath the laver," the "nets of checker work," the "wreaths of chain work," the "lily work on the chapiters," to all these we can find parallels; the pomegranates only are wanting at present. And such as that about the doors of the temple—"he carved thereon cherubim and palm trees and open flowers; and he overlaid them with gold fitted upon the graven work" (1 Kings vi. 35)—describes not only the subjects but the treatment we have studied on the ivories. "Ivory work overlaid with sapphire" (Song of Songs vi. 14) no longer seems an extravagant picture of the body of the beloved, and the spirit of our ivories is the same spirit which is reflected in the forty-fifth Psalm.'

Power Within.

The notes of the addresses at the 1932 Keswick Convention have been published by Messrs. Pickering & Inglis—*The Keswick Convention, 1932* (2s. 6d. net). The speakers whose names appear most frequently are Bishop Taylor Smith, the late Rev. W. Y. Fullerton, Dr. S. D. Gordon, and the Rev. John Macbeath. Bishop Taylor Smith has a

¹ Greville Macdonald, *Reminiscences of a Specialist*, 30.

number of illustrations, and we quote one on 'Power Within.' 'Visiting Holland some little time ago this was brought home to me. As I walked by one of their canals, I saw a windmill, but there was no wind that day, and, consequently, the sails were silent. And I remarked to a young officer who was walking with me, "What an illustration of the saints of the Old Testament, waiting for the power to make them live to some purpose." Then we drew near to the windmill, and we heard a strange sound. "Let us go in," I said, and going inside I found there was a motor. The owner had placed within the mill a motor, so that when the wind was not blowing without, he had the power within, so that it would pump and send the water to his field and to every part of the farm. And as we had noticed the power without, so we noticed the power within: and we strengthened each other in the Lord as we marked the illustration by the way.'

Will Life be worth Living in a World at Peace?

Religion in Life is a new American Christian Quarterly, published by the Abingdon Press. The 'Winter Number, 1933,' has a stimulating article by the former editor of 'The Times,' Henry Wickham Steed, on 'Do We Care for Peace?' In it he says: 'Some months ago, one of the elder boys in an ancient English Public School put to me a searching question. It was: "If war can be got rid of, will life be worth living in a world at peace?" On the spur of the moment I answered: "Since the attempt to get rid of war is the most revolutionary thing men have ever tried to do, the adventure of building up or creating an active state of peace in a world beyond war would be thrilling. We cannot even get rid of war without changing so many of our notions and habits that our particular way of life would go to pieces unless a better way could be found. The search for this better way would tax our hearts and minds to the utmost. It would give us fuller openings for heroism and self-sacrifice than war has ever offered. It would become a constant fight against evils which men have hitherto thought unconquerable. Compared with the bad old business of killing, which has now become a sort of scientific, anonymous mass murder, it would be a glorious enterprise."

'My answer seemed to kindle the imagination of the questioner and his schoolmates. On reflection, I realized its inadequacy. In truth, we have thought so little about peace that few, if any, of us are yet able to conceive, even dimly, what peace might be.

We know only that peace would not tolerate such a spectacle as we have witnessed during the past few years, when some regions of the world have been stifling in unsaleable abundance whilst others have been starving in the direst penury. Peace would not leave control of the sources of material wealth in private hands merely for private gain, but, while safeguarding individual freedom to the fullest extent compatible with social discipline, would look upon political citizenship and economic citizenship as interchangeable terms.'

Loyalty.

In *The Guardian* (January 6, 1933) there is a full and appreciative review of the biography of the late Bishop of Kensington—John Primatt Maud. The initials of the reviewer only are given—M.C. 'I would add a personal experience of my own,' he says, 'to show the loyalty with which the bishop stood by his friends. A blunder had been made in a report of a speech he had delivered at a public meeting, in which he criticized a certain attitude of the Press; and at once the whole weight of the popular Press was thrown at his head. If either of us was to blame, it was myself. Yet I shall never forget how he put his hand on my shoulder and said—with that mixture of strength and sympathy that so few can claim as their own—"Look here, my dear man, we're in this together, and we'll see it through together. My shoulders are broad enough to carry this—and a good deal more!"'

'Fiction.'

A correspondent who signs himself 'Anglo-Irishman' has sent the following letter to *The Guardian*, and it appears in their issue of December 23, 1932. Comment would appear to be unnecessary. 'Sir,—Your readers may be amused by a story which is the result of the present Free State duties on imports from the United Kingdom. If it is not true it is *ben trovato*. An Englishman wished to send some religious publications to a friend in the Free State. He dispatched them without attempting to pay duty, as he understood that religious literature was admitted free. To his surprise the parcel was held up as being dutiable. He complained over the telephone that he had in front of him a schedule of duties which expressly exempted religious literature. "But this literature," was the answer, "is not accepted as religious. It is Protestant literature." "To what class then," he inquired, "does it belong?" The reply to that was, "It is classed as fiction."'

'The Speaker's Bible.'

The latest volume of *The Speaker's Bible* deals with the Book of Psalms. It begins with Ps 104 and completes the book. Although review copies have only just been sent out, one review has appeared—in 'The Methodist Recorder.' The reviewer is Professor W. F. Howard, and this is what he says:

'The Rev. E. Hastings has edited and published, from The Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen (9s. 6d.), the fourth volume dealing with the Psalms in this well-known series. Beginning with Psalm civ. it carries us to the end of the Psalter. The scope and method of this series is too well known to call for detailed description. There is very much to be said in favour of this treatment of a book so directly devotional as the Book of Psalms. Anything that will encourage the devout and intelligent study of the Praises of Israel is of unquestionable advantage to the Christian Church. We are sure that many a class-leader would find inspiration in the study of this volume while preparing for the weekly meeting. As usual, we are struck by the wide range of quotation. The scholar's heart will be cheered by finding Gressmann cited, as well as Cheyne. The lover of literature will rejoice to meet with passages from Shakespeare, Tennyson, Shelley, Ruskin, R. L. S., Coleridge, Bacon, to name but a few out of many great writers. If Browning makes his contribution, so also does Mrs. Barclay, Fosdick, and Glover. R. F. Horton and W. T. Grenfell appear, and Robertson Nicoll and R. W. Dale do not prevent the appearance of Methodist preachers such as W. L. Watkinson, F. W. Macdonald, H. Maldwyn Hughes, and C. Ryder Smith. Indeed, it would be impossible to give any indication of the catholicity shown in the illustrative quotations. The popular volumes of sermons of our own time are well represented by such names as G. H. Morrison and J. M. E. Ross, A. J. Gossip and F. W. Boreham. Journalism is laid under tribute, and we find the "Methodist Recorder" and "The Guardian," Dean Inge, and Mr. A. J. Russell. In fact, though the Psalms give us the texts for our devotional meditations, we are in no danger of forgetting that they are universal in their message, and that they sound the depths of human experience in the world of our own day. Rightly used, this book will be a means of blessing to multitudes.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.